W Blane

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME IV.---NO. 34. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 190.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At 143, Nassau Street, New-York.

DAVID LEE CHILD, Editor.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to Isaac T. Hopper.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department: "A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

SPEECH OF MR. BEARDSLEY, OF NEW-YORK, ON THE RIGHT OF PETITION.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Jan. 5, 1844.

Mr. Dromgoole, of Virginia, moved to recommit the report made on a former day, by the select committee on rules; and Mr. Black, of Georgia, moved to amend the proposition to recommit, by instructing the committee to report, as one of the rules for the government of the House, the twenty-first rule of the last Congress, which is as follows:

"No petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or territory, or the slave-trade between the States or territories of the United States, in which it now exists, shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way whatever."

Mr. Beardsley observed that he had the honor of being appointed a member of the select committee which had been raised a few days since, to report to the House such rules as they supposed best calculated for the promotion of the public welfare, and for the transaction of business in this hall. That committee, with one or two exceptions, and those individually, he supposed, had sufficient reason for being absent; but about every member of that committee—

Mr. Dromgoole (a member of the committee) interposed, and said he rose to a question of order, or of decorum. Did the gentleman from New-York allude to the absence of the members of that committee?

Mr. Beardsley repeated his last remark, and inquired if the gentleman called him to order.

Mr. Dromgoole said, if the gentleman insisted upon the point of order, he (Mr. D.) did call him to order; and he would inquire of the Chair if it was in order for the gentleman to make allusion to the proceedings of the committee?

The Speaker was understood to say that it was not in accordance with parliamentary usage to allude to the proceedings of a committee.

Mr. Beardsley resumed. He had not spoken, nor intended to speak, of anything which had occurred in the committee; nor had he intended any reflection upon the gentlemen who might be supposed to fall within the remark he had made. He meant merely to affirm that the committee had taken upon themselves the duty enjoined by the House. They had labored for several weeks perseveringly, anxiously desiring to perfect the rules in the best mode for the transaction of the business of the House, and to preserve all the rights of the country. Now, the honorable member from Georgia, [Mr. Black,] had thought proper, in terms, to *challenge* the committee. Why, what the gentleman meant by challenging the committee, was more than he knew; and more, he presumed, than any member of the House knew.

Mr. Black interposed, remarking, that he had given no challenge; and, after some conversation between the two gentlemen, (Mr. B. yielding the floor for explanation,) proceeded to state that he had said that, upon this question of abolition—upon this question of reporting back a set of rules emasculated of the twenty-first rule—he "defied" the committee, he defied the majority of this House, or the majority of any other house in the country. He was sent here to defy any set of men who would open the legislation of the country, by emasculating the rules, to the abolitionists of the North, of the South, of the East, or of the West—he cared not whence they came—and permit them (Mr. B. was understood to say) to insult him personally, or to traduce the character of his constituents. Such men he was prepared to defy; his constituents had sent him here to defy them, and he did defy them.

Mr. Beardsley resumed. He was mistaken in the term which had been made use of by the gentleman; it was "*defied*," not "*challenged*," as he had first stated; but he might apply the same remark to the term which the gentleman now declared he had used. He did not know what it meant. The committee had intended nothing wrong to the gentleman, to his constituents, or to their property. For the gentleman to come here to *defy* the committee, to defy the House, or to defy the country, it was inexplicable to him. He saw no occasion for such outbreaks of passion, or high tones of defiance. And he begged the House, upon a subject as solemn as this, (for this had indeed become, in this country, a subject of most solemn consequence, and it should be discussed with that spirit of liberality which became every man on this floor,) not to be betrayed into undue excitement, or warmth of feeling. He felt it to be a subject of solemn and important consequence; and, although his convictions were firm and decided upon the matter, yet he would express them in a manner respectful to the House, and to other members, and so as to avoid injuring their feelings.

It had been said (continued Mr. B.) by the honorable member, in effect, that the committee had done wrong in reporting a set of rules which did not include the one which prohibited the reception of what were usually called abolition petitions.—That objection to the report existed also in other parts of the House; and it was fit it should be decided. With the gentleman who had moved the instruction now under consideration, he agreed that there was no better mode of meeting this question than on the instruction he had proposed. It called for a direct vote. It was a fair mode of ascertaining the judgment of the House—of meeting and disposing of the question, whether they should have a rule which shut out of doors petitions of the character to which the rule referred. It had been Mr. B.'s fortune to be several years a member of the House. He had uniformly voted to receive petitions of this character. At an early period of the time he had been here, he had voted (as was the practice, and as then, upon the whole, it was his own impression of the propriety of the matter) to refer these petitions to committees—sometimes to the committee for the District of Columbia, and at other times to select committees. At that period, very little, and he could not say from memory that any question had been made whether they should be referred or not. At a subsequent period, the question had been made, whether they should be referred; and his own opinion having been made up finally and definitively upon all these petitions, and against their prayer, he had been ready to act upon the subject at any time, and had therefore repeatedly voted to place them upon the table, after they had been received by the House. He regarded this as a summary method of disposing of them. He had voted in accordance with what was said to be the southern view of the question, but what seemed to him the constitutional and American view. He had made no distinction, in this respect, between the North and the South; holding that what was wise and just towards one section, was equally so towards the other. He had believed then, as he believed now, that it was inexpedient to grant the prayer of any of the petitions that had been presented here on this subject. But upon the great and solemn question, whether they should receive these petitions, Mr. B.'s opinion was, that they were bound by the Constitution of the United States—that they were bound in common right, as freemen, and as honest men—that they were under all the obligations which could rest upon members of this body in any case, to receive these petitions. If these might be repelled from the House, so might all others.

It was important to ascertain what was meant by "the right of petition." Some gentlemen seemed to suppose that the right existed, but that this House had a paramount right, at its own good pleasure, to repel petitions and petitioners from this hall. What sort of a right was that—a right to petition for redress of grievances—if the body to which it is addressed has this paramount right to close its doors against the petitioners? Did the reception of a petition affirm that they approved of its contents, and were ready and willing to grant its prayer? Too many gentlemen seemed to think so. Let them exercise their sound common sense; let them distinguish between the duty to receive petitions, and act upon them in some manner, and the right and the duty to exercise their own judgment upon the question of granting their prayer. The duty to receive petitions, he considered to be imperative; and so was the duty which arose on their reception, to pass upon them in such manner as might best promote the great ends of government—the promotion and perfection of the true interests of the whole community. In receiving a petition, they simply said that they would accord to the petitioners their common right—a right which every member here enjoyed, and which they were, as he believed, bound to accord to every citizen of the country. How, he would ask, did the right of petition stand in England? (for they might draw instruction from England upon this subject.) He affirmed that, under the most arbitrary reign in England, the time had never been that a petition addressed to the British parliament had been spurned out of doors, as they had been in the habit of driving petitions of this character out of doors here. He knew that formerly, in England, persons who petitioned the king for redress of grievances, had sometimes been fined and imprisoned for it; and he knew that, by the theory of the British constitution, sovereignty was supposed to reside in the individual who sat upon the throne. But although a monarch had treated petitions in this manner, parliament had never done as they had been doing in this hall, for a few years past. If they went to the bill of rights—the bill which grew out of the revolution of 1688, and which was assented to by the king and by parliament—they found that it expressly declared in words and letters, in the most emphatic manner, the unqualified right of the subject to petition the sovereign. Mr. Black read from the bill of rights upon this subject. It asserts "that it is the right of the subject to petition the king; and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitions are illegal." And this, with all other rights therein asserted, are declared to be "the *true, ancient*, and *indubitable* rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom." Nothing can be more explicit than this recognition of the rights of Englishmen. It was their *true*, their *ancient*, and their *indubitable* right; and no king should be permitted to deny or abridge it. It was true that in a prior reign, (that of Charles II. he believed,) for the purpose of guarding against riotous and tumultuous assemblages with a view to petition parliament had passed a law regulating the exercise of the right of petition—not refusing to receive petitions, but declaring that not beyond a certain number of persons should assemble together for this purpose, without the assent of the proper magistrates; but never, under the most arbitrary reign in England, had it occurred to any one that the legislature of that country, might impose on the people by debarring them from the right of petition. Such, at least, was the principle on which the right of petition stood in England. It stood as recognized and declared by the bill of rights of 1688, modified and regulated with a view to guard against disturbances. In other respects, the right was unqualified and unrestricted.

Now let us look a little at the history of this country, and see what had been the opinions of those who had preceded them in this hall, and what they had done, as well as those who had framed and adopted the several State constitutions, and that of this Union. One general truth, he believed, would be found to prevail—that there was not a State in the Union that had not secured, either in her constitution or in her bill of rights, this sacred right of the people, to petition for a redress of grievances. So sacred had been the regard for it, so uniform had been the States in protecting it, that they would find in every State of the Union, (without a single exception, he believed,) it was guarded in most unqualified and precise terms. Had it ever before been heard, in a legislative body, that they should refuse to receive petitions?—he meant those which were decorous and respectful to the body to which they were addressed. If that was their character, they were received by all the State legislatures in this Union. But this was not all. Let them ascertain what was the opinion of those who preceded them here. When the Constitution of the United States was framed, it contained no bill of rights; and in your State, (said Mr. B. addressing the speaker,) in the State of Virginia, it was one of the great and formidable obstacles—one of the potent objections against ratifying that Constitution—that it contained no declaration of the rights of the citizen. Virginia finally assented to the Constitution as it was; but the same convention which had ratified it, recommended, in most explicit terms, that the Constitution should be amended by "a declaration or bill of rights, asserting and securing from encroachment, the *essential* and *inalienable* rights of the people," therein specified; one of which was, "that every freeman has a right to petition or apply to the legislature for redress of grievances." This right was thus asserted to be "*essential*"—important—vital. it was "*inalienable*"—always existing, and not transferable. And this right, Virginia insisted, should be guarded from all "*encroachment*." Virginia (continued Mr. B.) planted herself on that principle—nobly planted herself on that very principle which this House seemed essentially to have disregarded.

She had put her objections to the Constitution upon the omission of this and other provisions, which she had regarded essential to be contained in the Constitution. Well, conformably to the recommendation of Virginia, the Constitution of the United States had been amended. That amendment recognized, and most explicitly, this "inalienable" right, this "essential" right; for the language of Virginia was, that it was "essential," that it was important, that it was vital. It was "inalienable." Therefore, at all times, it existed in the people; they could not transfer it. It was inextinguishable; and this right, the constitutional amendment declared Congress should make no law to abridge.

And what was the right of petition on the part of the people, unless it was compulsory that their petitions should be received? not that their prayers should be granted, but that they should be received. The right of petition existed everywhere. Every citizen of this republic had the "essential" and "inalienable" right to petition government for redress of grievances, for what they conceive to be grievances; and although we may not regard them as grievances, that furnishes no reason for their rejection. Such were the grounds occupied by Virginia at the adoption of the Constitution; and that instrument had been amended on her suggestion, recognizing this right, and declaring that Congress should make no law abridging "the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." No one, then, believed that either house of Congress alone would venture to deny or abridge this right." Hence, the restraint is upon Congress. Congress cannot, by law, abridge it, or lay any restraint upon it. Much less can one House alone rightfully destroy or impair it. Was it not, then, an utter fallacy to maintain that this House—one branch of the legislative power—had a right to bar its doors, and refuse to receive the petitions which were sent here for the redress of the grievances, or of the imagined grievances, of the people? (for these were the grounds on which they stood here.)

Mr. B. maintained that it was the right of every citizen to come here and to present what he considered his grievance; and that they were to receive and treat it in a respectful manner, and then to exercise their own judgment as to the propriety of complying with his request.

One answer to this view of the subject, and one ground urged for denying the exercise of the right of petition, was, that these petitioners prayed for unconstitutional objects, such as this House, such as Congress, had not the power to grant to them. And Mr. B. was very free to admit, that, when a petition asked them to do that which they had plainly no right to do, as the petition was addressed to a tribunal which, in legal parlance, had no jurisdiction over the subject, they might with propriety, and without giving cause of offense to any one, refuse to receive it.

But the argument was carried still further; and it was urged that when petitions were presented, the granting a part of the prayers of which would be constitutional and of the other unconstitutional, the unconstitutional portions ought to control the House in disposing of them, and therefore that the whole petition, the constitutional as well as the unconstitutional part, should be driven out of doors. Now, Mr. B. was far from acceding to that proposition. Why should it be so? The petitioner asks them to redress grievances which they had a right to redress, and also to redress grievances over which they had no power. Were they not to receive and act upon the parts which were constitutional? He must say that, in his estimation, that was the proper mode of disposing of that class of petitions. The unconstitutional prayers were no reason whatever, for excluding from their consideration those which were constitutional, while they disregarded the others.

Mr. B. said he might, on this subject, appeal to whatever had heretofore been done by this House. The very first Congress under the Constitution had acted upon this very question; and the example which they had left for us, might furnish a very proper guide for the House on the present occasion. In 1790, the Quakers presented a petition to Congress, praying, among other things, "the abolition of the slave-trade," which Congress had no power to grant, until 1808. At the same period, a memorial of the Pennsylvania society for promoting the abolition of slavery, signed by Dr. Franklin, as president, was also presented to this House. This memorial earnestly prayed Congress "to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men who alone, in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage; and who, amidst the general joy of surrounding freemen, are groaning in servile subjection;" that "mercy and justice towards this distressed race" might be promoted; and that Congress would step "to the very verge of the power vested in" them "for discouraging every species of traffic in the persons of their fellow-men."

These petitions were received by the House of Representatives, but some of the members from the South strenuously objected to their reference, as they prayed for the immediate suppression of the slave-trade—an object beyond the power of Congress—the Constitution having expressly tolerated it until 1808. It was also urged that the memorials called for the abolition of slavery in the States, which was a subject over which Congress had no control or authority. These objections were pressed with urgency and with force, but without success. Mr. Madison declared himself in favor of the reference, as a course not only just and constitutional, but also founded in sound policy. The commitment, he said, had not the slightest tendency to break in upon the Constitution; "the petitioners prayed, in general terms, for the interference of Congress, so far as they were constitutionally authorized;" but even if the prayer was, in some respects, unconstitutional, still it should be referred, as had been done in the case of another petition mentioned by him, "one part of which was supposed to apply for an unconstitutional interference by the general government." On a division, the memorials were referred, by a vote of more than three to one. Shortly after, and in regard to the same memorials, the House came to a resolution, "that Congress have no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them, within any of the States; it remaining with the several States alone to provide any regulation therein which humanity and true policy may require." Mr. B. declared that he fully agreed to the doctrine of that resolution. Over the subject of slavery in the States, the States alone had any power. In the discussion of the resolution, that ground was distinctly taken; and in the adoption of the resolution, it was affirmed by the House. No such doctrine was at that day heard of, as not receiving a petition because some part of it prayed for objects which Congress had no power to grant. No such doctrine was heard among the fathers of the Constitution, the venerable fathers and founders of our great political churches. It was a doctrine which had grown up of late days, and had obtained all its strength within a very few years past. Madison had been against it; the first House of Representatives had been against it; that body had affirmed, on the contrary, the true principle of British liberty and American liberty also. All our political fathers were advocates of the right of petition; and, though the people might petition for things some of which were in themselves unconstitutional, that was no reason that they and their petitions were to be driven out of doors.

If this principle were the true one, then it remained only to see whether this class of petitions, to which the rule pointed, were for objects unconstitutional or not. Mr. B. admitted that, when petitions asked Congress to interfere between master and slave in the States, they stood on ground prohibited by the Constitution. On this point, Mr. B.'s convictions were just as strong as those of the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Black,] although he might not accompany or express them with quite so much fervor of feeling. He was not, however, at all surprised that southern gentlemen should feel very strongly on the subject; nor did he blame them for it. A portion of these petitions referred to the abolition of the traffic in slaves between the States. To this branch of the subject, Mr. B. had not paid so much attention; he was firmly of opinion against the expediency of passing any law for such prohibition: but whether or not Congress possessed the power to pass such a law, he was not fully satisfied. But he waived that, as irrelevant to the present question.

Another subject of these petitions was the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the territory of Florida. Now, he was decidedly in favor of leaving the laws as they were, in this respect; yet he could not say that he entertained any doubt that Congress possessed constitutional power to do what the petitioners asked, if they chose to do it. He took it for granted, that, in regard to slavery in the abstract, there existed at the North, and at the West, and at the South, but one sentiment. He presumed that, were the South now free from slaves, no southern man would wish to see slavery introduced there. On this point, all the people of the Union, he supposed, were agreed. Slavery had come down upon the present generation in the South without their fault; and, situated as they were, he really did not know what they were to do with their slaves, but to retain them as they are.

Mr. E. J. Black here interposed; and, having obtained the floor for explanation, observed that the gentleman from New-York seemed to suppose that the people of Georgia regarded slavery as an evil; he should not now attempt to argue the point, but he could assure the gentleman he was wholly mistaken; Mr. Black's constituents did not regard it as an evil at all, but quite the contrary.

Mr. Beardsley resumed, and thanked the gentleman for correcting any error into which he had fallen; he had had no particular reference to the gentleman's constituents, but had spoken generally. Opinions upon slavery depend much upon education; and were, to some extent, matters of taste. He should not dwell on the subject, for it had, in strictness, nothing to do with the main question under discussion. He had referred to it in passing to the reasons which induced him to think it inexpedient for Congress to interfere with the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia. Maryland and Virginia, the two States which surrounded the District, and enclosed it by their territory, were both of them slaveholding States; and so long as they are continued such, to abolish slavery within the District would do no practical good to the slaves, nor anybody else. For this reason, he was against exercising the power which Congress possessed over the subject, though he believed it to be plenary.

And here he would add a word, to show on what ground it was he held the doctrine that Congress has full power to abolish slavery in the district. But he must remark, in the outset, that he could not agree in the opinion put forth by one of his colleagues, [Mr. Davis,] viz: that the very act of ceding the district to Congress for a seat of government, did, in itself, of necessity, work the abolition of slavery within the district so ceded. Mr. B. held no such opinion. The Constitution, as adopted by the States, provided that Congress might accept a district of territory not exceeding ten miles square, if ceded by one or more of the States, for the seat of the federal government. Subsequently to its adoption, Virginia ceded one part, and Maryland another, of the present District of Columbia—both providing, in the act of cession, that the laws of Virginia and Maryland should remain and continue in full force until Congress should otherwise order. At that time, slavery formed a part of the law of both States, and these laws in relation to slavery would remain in force accordingly. And Congress, in accepting the cession, declared, in words, that the laws of Virginia and Maryland should continue in force in the District of Columbia till otherwise provided by Congress. Those laws were in force now; and if slavery was lawful in Virginia and Maryland at the date of the cession, it was lawful in the district now. It stood to this hour on that footing.—Congress adopted for the district, laws which, in terms, legalized slavery in the district.

Having thus pointed to the grounds on which slavery rested in this district, he was bound to show that Congress had power to interfere to abolish these laws, and enact others. The same Constitution which permitted the cession of the district, declared that over it Congress should have full, complete, and exclusive jurisdiction, "in all cases whatsoever."

Mr. Black, of Georgia, (interposing.) Those are not the terms of the Constitution; Congress has exclusive, but not unlimited jurisdiction.

Mr. Beardsley resuming. Well, I may not have quoted the precise words, for I have not the Constitution before me; but sure I am, it gives to Congress exclusive jurisdiction *in all cases whatsoever*. It gives to Congress, within the district, for this purpose, as full power as parliament possesses in Great Britain. Within those limits Congress can do anything.

Mr. Black. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. Beardsley. Certainly.

Mr. Black. Can Congress, within the District of Columbia, establish an order of nobility, or create a religious establishment?

Mr. Beardsley. Of course not. We find in the Constitution express limits to the power of Congress, some of which apply to the district as much as to the States; but those restrictions have no application to this subject of abolishing slavery. The Constitution gives, I repeat it, to Congress, exclusive jurisdiction over this district. The words are: Congress may "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over it. This power is given to Congress, as fully and absolutely as State legislature possess it over the States. May not the legislatures of Virginia abolish slavery in that State? May not the legislature of Georgia exercise a similar power? Who can doubt it? This power has been too frequently exercised to be now drawn in question. Every State north of Delaware has, at one time or another, exercised this power of abolishing slavery within its own limits; for it has, at some period, existed among them all. I shall not stop here to inquire whether the States could abolish it without providing remuneration to the slaveholder; that is a different question: that they have no power to do it, either with or without compensation, is as plain as words can make it. And why should they not? Cannot they pass a law to do it? They may pay the master or not, but cannot they take the slave compulsorily from the master? Surely they can; and that's enough to give Congress jurisdiction of the subject in this district.

Yet (said Mr. B.) although such is my clear conviction as to this question of power, my unqualified opinion is adverse to its exercise in a district situated as this is, in regard to slave States surrounding it.

Mr. B. said there was another idea to which he wished to advert. It had been said that the representation in this House, founded in part on the slave population, as authorized by the Constitution, was one of the compromises which gave life and being to the Constitution, and that any change in this respect, by an amendment of that instrument, as its provisions authorized, would at once destroy the Constitution itself, and necessarily dissolve the Union.

Now, sir, (said Mr. B.) I desire to be distinctly understood. I am for standing firmly by the Constitution, with all its compromises and balances, as they are; and am as decidedly opposed to the amendment recommended by the legislature of Massachussetts, as any gentleman south of the Potomac can be. I agree with the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. Hamlin,] that the North is as firmly attached to the Constitution, in all its provisions, as the South can claim to be. But, settled as my conviction in this aspect is, I cannot forbear an expression of my deep surprise, my especial wonder, that such consequences as I have stated should be deduced from such premises.

The Constitution authorizes its own change and amendment, and declares the mode in which amendments may be made. This is not all: it also declares, in most explicit and emphatic terms, that amendments, when thus made, become "valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution." There is no limit to this power of amendment which in any degree, bears upon this question. Each and every part, with a few specified exceptions, may thus be changed and modified; and still the Constitution will exist, as amended, in all its plenitude of obligation and of power. Amendments have repeatedly been made, and in the most delicate parts of its structure; and still it is in force. And yet we are told that the instrument itself may thus be constitutionally amended out of existence. Sir, is not this paradoxical, not to say absurd? Is it possible that an amendment, constitutionally made, can ever work out any such disastrous consequence? What part of the Constitution, let me ask, is there, which may not be changed by amendment? The Constitution, as it now is, indicates what shall be the qualifications of electors of members of this House. May not these be changed by an amendment, and the Constitution still survive the change? It is part of the Constitution itself that it may be amended. To this the States assented, when they became members of the Union; and no change which can be made in the organic law, in accordance with the Constitution, can, in any degree, impair its obligation, or annul its power.

But the reason given for this new principle of constitutional construction is not less remarkable than the bold inference deduced from it. The slave representation was yielded as a compromise to secure the ratification of the Constitution; and hence, any change in this part of the fundamental law would work out this mighty consequence. I admit the fact, but I deny the conclusion. This sir, was not the only essential part of the Constitution which was adjusted by a compromise of rights and interests. Upon this principle the large States asserted to an equal representation in the Senate. On the same principle, and for the same purpose, the States, whose local position would have attracted and secured most of the external trade of the country, gave up to the general government about to be created, all power to impose duties on imports. This, and other vital powers, by which some of the States might have enriched themselves at the expense of others, were all surrendered to make us, for all national purposes, one people. The Constitution, it has been well said, is but a bundle of compromises, in which some rights were relinquished and some acquired. On these terms, the several States agreed to unite for the common benefit of all; and with the express declaration, on the face of the compact, that any changes in its structure or provisions, when made and assented to in a particular manner, should thereby "be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution," and, consequently, binding upon every member of the Union.

But I leave this subject, Mr. Speaker. I have already stated that I was against any such change in the Constitution, although I felt no difficulty on the question of power. Nor is there any danger of such a change. Why should the basis of representation in this House be changed? Who believes that it will be changed? It is altogether ideal and imaginary; nobody seriously even dreams of such a thing. It is in the highest degree improbable, and should disturb no one. But if gentlemen *will* make the question of power, we must of course discuss it; and I again insist that the Constitution may be just as well amended in this respect as in any other. But I dismiss that subject; it is foreign to the question before us. I voted for the reference of the Massachusetts resolutions, not because I was in favor of the amendment they propose. And here let me say, Mr. Speaker, with all possible respect, that an attachment to the Constitution of this Union, is not exclusively possessed by gentlemen of the South. I admit, and I know, that the men of the South are a noble people; but I beg them to believe that we of the North, have some little reverence for the Constitution, and some degree of attachment to the Union, as well as they. I hope and trust in God that there is on this subject an American feeling, far above all sectional interests and sectional considerations!

In brief, then, I hold it to be the constitutional right of every citizen to petition Congress, and I hold it to be our duty to receive their petitions, unless they are disrespectful in their terms—in which case we are not bound to listen, any more than a gentleman is bound to hold converse with one who addresses him in vile and abusive language. I will make one other exception; for if the petition asks that which is plainly unconstitutional, and that only, I see no objection to refusing it a hearing. But, subject to these limitations, it is our imperative duty to receive all petitions addressed to us. When they have been received, we can treat them as we think proper. I have voted, in times past, sometimes to refer them, and sometimes to lay them on the table. I have no sort of hesitation in voting against the prayer of these abolition petitions, at any time; yet I think they should be received, and sent to the same committee as the Massachusetts resolutions. We have tried many modes of disposing of them. They have been referred to the committee for the District of Columbia; then we sent them to a select committee, composed mainly of gentlemen from the South, or holding southern sentiments; then we tried laying them on the table; and now, in these latter days, we have fallen on this new expedient of shutting the door against them. The last remedy I look upon as the worst of all. It has produced more agitation through the country, and more confusion and contention here, than anything done from the foundation of the government. What can be the object of refusing a reference? Is it the prevention of insurrection and murders at the South? On that subject, let me say that I apprehend (though, to be sure, on such a subject southern gentlemen may be presumed to know best) that the slaves, at least the great body of them, are wholly ignorant of what is done here in regard to them, or at the North generally; and even should the subject be debated here, it can, as I suppose, have very little influence upon the slaves.

Do gentlemen ask what object we expect to attain by receiving these petitions? I answer, the preservation of harmony between the northern and southern portions of this Union; and, besides that, the preservation of peace and harmony in this hall. It will repress contention; it will keep out these angry and inflamed struggles. What has the refusal to receive these petitions done but to create perpetual strife and denunciation? Let us receive them, and refer them to an appropriate committee. If that committee shall report for our adoption, any measure which is unconstitutional or improper, we have power to act upon and reject it. Suppose a committee shall report in favor of these resolutions of the Massachusetts legislature: is Congress therefore bound to assent? Can we not take the sense of the House upon the report? And let me say to gentlemen from the South, if they adopt this course, they will soon find who are their friends. I do not speak in any party sense. I mean they will then discover who are friends to the integrity of the Union—who are for standing by them and by the Constitution. But this they never can discover, so long as they suffer the right of petition to be mixed up with the question of abolition: never, so long as they insist on practically destroying the right of petition. On that question the North are quite as much united as the South are united on the subject of slavery. Let us both unite on the Constitution. On that firm, immovable basis, let us agree to stand, one and all. I firmly believe this is the true course; this is the way to put an end to all our dissensions. But the remedy of driving petitioners out of doors, is a wrong course; it is affrontful to them, and in my view a violation of the Constitution. It never will end agitation, either here or elsewhere. I therefore would beseech gentlemen of the South to change the question. I pray them to consider and respect the right of petition. Let them do this, and they will find the great body of the people of this Union rallying around them and with them. But on what many regard as the question of the sacred right of petition, they will find, if not a majority against them, (as in such case I hope they may,) at least a large and decided phalanx of the freemen of this country their irreconcilable opponents.

From the True Sun.

AFFECTING SCENE.

A clergyman who was recently travelling in the South, and a passenger on board of a steamboat on Cape Fear River, observed some of the consequences of slavery, which he has communicated to the public. We are no abolitionists, in the received sense of the word—we believe the Constitution must be kept inviolate; yet we cannot conceal our horror at scenes like those described in the following extract from the Christian Journal. The writer says:

As I went on board the steamboat, I noticed eight colored men, handcuffed, and chained together in pairs, four women, and eight or ten children, of the apparent ages of from four to ten years, all standing together in the bow of the boat, in charge of a man standing near them. Of the men, one was sixty, one was fifty-two, three of them about thirty, two of them twenty-five, and one about twenty years of age, as I subsequently learned from them. The two first had children, the next three had wives and children, and the other three were single, but had parents living from them. Coming near them, I perceived that they were all greatly agitated; and on inquiry, I found that they were all slaves, who had been born and raised in North Carolina, and had just been sold to a speculator, who was now taking them to Charleston market.

Upon the shore, there was a number of colored persons, men, women, and children, waiting the departure of the boat; and my attention was particularly attracted by two colored females, of uncommonly respectable appearance, neatly attired, who stood together, a little distance from the crowd, and upon whose countenance was depicted the keenest sorrow. As the last bell was tolling, I saw the tears gushing from their eyes, and they raised their neat cotton aprons, and wiped their faces under the cutting anguish of severed affections. They were the wives of two of the men in chains. There, too, were mothers and sisters, weeping at the departure of their sons and brothers; and there, too, were fathers, taking the last look of their wives and children. My whole attention was directed to those on the shore, and they seemed to stand in solemn, submissive silence, occasionally giving utterance to the intensity of their feelings, by a sigh, or a stifled groan. As the boat was loosed from her moorings, they cast a distressed, lingering look toward those on board, and turned away in silence. My eye now turned to those in the boat; although I had tried to control my feelings, amidst my sympathies for those on shore, I could conceal them no longer, and I found myself literally "weeping with those that weep." I stood near them, and when one of the husbands saw his wife upon the shore waive her hand for the last time, in token of her affection, his manly efforts to restrain his feelings, gave way, and fixing his watery eyes, exclaimed. "This is the most distressing thing of all! My dear wife and children, farewell!" The husband of the other wife stood weeping in silence, with his manacled hands raised to his face, as he looked upon her for the last time.

Of the poor women on board, three of them had husbands whom they left behind. One of the third had none. These husbands and fathers were among the throng upon the shore, witnessing the departure of their wives and children; and as they took their leave of them they were sitting together upon the floor of the boat, sobbing in silence, but giving utterance to no complaint. But the distressing scene was not yet ended. Sailing down the Cape Fear river twenty-five miles, we touched at the little village of Smithport, on the south side of the river. It was at this place that one of these slaves lived, and here was his wife and five children; and while at work on Monday last, his purchaser took him away from his family, carried him in chains to Wilmington, where he has since remained in jail. As we approached the wharf, a flood of tears gushed from his eyes, and anguish seemed to have pierced his heart The boat stopped but a moment, and as she left, he bid farewell to some of his acquaintances whom he saw upon the shore, exclaiming, "Boys, I wish you well; tell Molly (meaning his wife) and the children I wish them well, and hope God will bless them." At that moment he espied his wife on a stoop of a house some rods from the shore, and with one hand, which was not in the hand-cuffs, he pulled off his old hat, and waivng it toward her exclaimed, "Farewell." As he saw, by the waving of her apron, that she recognized him, he leaned back upon the railing, and in a faltering voice repeated, "Farewell, forever." After a moment's silence, conflicting passions seemed to tear open his heart and he exclaimed, "What have I done that I should suffer this doom? O, my wife and children, I want to live no longer!" and then the big tear rolled down his cheek, which he wiped away with the palm of his unchained hand, looked once more at the mother of his five children, and the turning of the boat hid her face from him forever. As I looked around, I saw that mine was not the only heart that had been affected by the scene, but that the tears standing in the eyes of many of my fellow passengers, bore testimony to the influence of human sympathy; and I could, as an American citizen, standing within the limits of one of the old thirteen States, but repeat the language of Mr. Jefferson, in relation to the general subject: "I tremble when I think that God is just." After we left Smithport, I conversed freely with all these persons; and in intelligence and respectability of appearance, the three men who have thus been torn from their families, would compare favorably with the respectable portion of our colored men at the north. This is a specimen of what almost daily occurs in the business of the slave trade.

From the New-York Herald.

PUBLIC DEBTS OF THE STATES.

The public debts of the States of this Union, have reached an amount, and stand in a position that calls for serious reflection from those who created them, and those who have the power in hand to prevent an increase, and to provide for the ultimate liquidation of them. The whole and total indebtedness of this country, in the aggregate, when compared with the immense wealth and unlimited resources of the United States; is but a trifle, but when the people proclaim their unwillingness to pay, when the disposition to not pay, becomes visible, then, and not until then, should those interested, or those that have invested, despair. The people of this country can say to the nations of Europe, we are able, and will liquidate the last dollar of our indebtedness. The cause, the direct cause of the insolvency of the States deeply indebted, can be traced to the financial revolution we are just emigrating from. The whole country has for years been struggling against the most desperate depression, any nation ever experienced.

Our internal difficulties have been so serious, that it required the most rigid economy and self-denial in many instances, of the necessaries of life, to again reach the position we occupied before the great bubble commenced. We have just recovered our legs again, and the first step towards retrieving the past, is to provide for the satisfactory settlement of our debts; to arrive at some result with our foreign creditors, and give them to understand that the instant our domestic difficulties have disappeared, we are determined to do something for others. The debt of every State in the Union, including that of the State government would fall but lightly on every individual, if equally and justly distributed. Many of our tax laws are unjust, and fall heavily on those least able to hear them. By a thorough reformation of those abuses, by placing the burden of taxation on all, according to the value of their property, the laws will be submitted to until the last cent is paid, and the returns of the collectors exhibit different returns than those before reported.

DEBTS OF THE STATES AND THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT.

	Am't. of Debts.	*Am't of Interest.*	*Population*
Maine,	$1,881,715	86,743	501,793
Massachusetts,	7,720,539	385,026	737,699
New-York,	23,847,166	1,377,260	2,428 921
Pennsylvania,	39,290,461	1,941,287	1,724,033
Maryland,	16,386,657	1,113,580	470,019
Virginia,	5,963,861	283,226	1,239,797
S. Carolina,	3,495,164	209,709	594,398
N. Carolina,	1,050,000	63,000	753,419
Georgia,	1,617,685	96,000	631,192
Kentucky,	3,964,500	232,270	779,828
Tennessee,	3,260,416	173,678	829,210
Ohio,	18,668,391	1,025,299	1,519,467
Louisiana,	20,558,000	1,018,444	352,411
Indiana,	11,943,915	597,196	685,866
Mississippi,	7,000,000	420,000	375,651
Illinois,	14,703,749	882,225	476,183
Alabama,	9,834,005	590,040	590,756
Missouri,	853,846	50,230	383,702
Arkansas,	3,500,000	210,000	97,574
Michigan,	5,611,000	318,170	212,267
Florida,	3,900,000	234,000	54,477
Dis. of Columbia,	1,380,000	82,800	43,712
State Debts,	$206,361,000	$11,481,113	15,522,575
U. S. Debt,	26,644,648	1,598,679	17,969,453
Total,	$233,005,648	$13,079,792	

The above table shows the total indebtedness of the general and State governments. The average amount for every man, woman and child in the indebted States, is $13.35, and of interest 67 cents. The proportion of the debt of the general government to every inhabitant, is $1 50. and the interest 9 cents. The total amount of the whole debt is little rising of two hundred and thirty-three millions of dollars.

DEMAGOGUE ARTS.

BY LORD BROUGHAM.

Lord Brougham concludes his sketches of the celebrated English radical, John Wilkes, with the following just and forcible passage on the Arts of the Demagogues:

"The fall, the rapid and total declension of Wilkes' fame—the utter oblivion into which his very name has passed for all purposes save the remembrance of his vices—the very ruins of his reputation, no longer remaining in our political history—this affords also a salutary lesson to the followers of the multitude—those who may court applause of the hour, and regulate their conduct towards the people, not by their own sound and conscientious opinions of what is right, but by the desire to gain fame by doing what is pleasing, and to avoid giving the displeasure that arises from telling wholesome, though unpalatable truths. Never man more pandered to the appetites of the mob, than Wilkes; never political pimp gave more uniform contentment to his employers. Having the moral and sturdy English and not the voluble and versatile Irish, to deal with, he durst not do or say as he chose himself: but was compelled to follow that he might seem to lead, or at least to go two steps with his followers, that he might get them to go with him. He dared not deceive them grossly, clumsily, openly, impudently—dared not tell them opposite stories—in the same breath—give them one advice to-day and the contrary to-morrow—pledge himself to a dozen things at one and the same time; then come before them with every pledge unredeemed, and ask their voices, and their money on the credit of as many other pledges, for the succeeding half year—all this, with the obstinate and jealous people of England, was out of the question; it could not have passed for six weeks. But he committed as great, if not as gross, frauds upon them; abused their confidence as entirely if not so shamelessly; catered for their depraved appetite in all the base dainties of sedition and slander, and thoughtless violence, and unreasonable demands, instead of using his influence to guide their judgment, improve their taste, reclaim them from bad courses, and better their condition by providing for their instruction. The means by which he retained their attachment were disgraceful and vile—like the hypocrite, his whole life was a lie. The tribute which his unruly appetites kept him from paying to private morals, his dread of the mob, or his desire to use them for his selfish purposes, made him yield to public virtue; and he never appeared before the world without the mask of patriotic enthusiasm or democratic fury;—he who, in the recesses of Mendenham Abbey, and before many witnesses, gave the Eucharist to an ape, or, prostituted the printing press to multiply copies of a production that would dye with blushes the cheek of an impure.

It is the abuse, no doubt, of such popular courses, that we should reprobate. Popularity is far from being contemptable; it is often an honorable acquisition; when duly earned, always a test of good done or evil resisted. But to be of a pure and genuine kind, it must have one stamp—the security of one safe and certain die; it must be the popularity that follows good actions, not that which is run after. Nor can we do a greater service to the people themselves, or read a more wholesome lesson to the race, above all, of rising statesmen, than to mark how much the mock-patriot, the mob-seeker, the parasite of the giddy multitude, falls into the very worst faults for which popular men are wont the most loudly to condemn, and most heartily to despise, the courtly fawners upon princes. Flattery, indeed! obsequiousness! time-serving; What courtier of them all ever took more pains to soothe an irritable or to please a capricious prince, than Wilkes, to assuage the anger or gain the favor by humoring the prejudices of the mob? Falshood, truly! intrigue! manœuvre! Where did ever titled suitor for promotion lay his plots more cunningly, or spread more wide his net, or plant more pensively in the fire those irons by which the waiters upon royal bounty forge to themselves and their country chains, that they also may make the ladder they are to mount by, than the patriot of the city did to delude the multitude, whose slave he made himself, that he might be rewarded with their sweet voices, and so rise to wealth and to power? When he penned the letter of cant about administering justice, rather than join a procession to honor the accession of a prince whom in a private petition he covered over thick and threefold with the slime of his flattery, he called himself a "manœuvre." When he delivered a rant about liberty before the reverent judges of the land—he knew full well that he was not delighting those he addressed, but the mob out of doors, on whose ears the trash was to be echoed back. When he spoke a speech in parliament, of which no one heard a word, and said aside to a friend who urged the fruitlessness of the attempt at making the house listen—"Speak it I must, for it has been printed in the newspapers this half hour"—he confessed that he was acting a false part in one place to compass a real object in another; as thoroughly as ever minister did when affecting by smiles to be well in his prince's good graces, before the multitude, all the while knowing that he was receiving a royal rebuke. When he and one confederate, in the private room of a tavern, issued a declaration, beginning, "we, the people," and signed "by the order of the meeting,"—he practiced as gross a fraud upon that people, as ever peer or parasite did, when affecting to pine for the princes's smiles, and to be devoted to his pleasure, in all the life they led consecrated to the furtherance of their own."

How to Disarm an Enemy.—It is said that bees and wasps will not sting a person whose skin is imbued with honey. Hence those who are much exposed to the venom of these little creatures, when they have occasion to hive bees, or to take a nest of wasps, smear their face and hands with honey, which is found to be the best preservative. When we are annoyed with insult, persecution and opposition, from perverse and malignant men, the best defense against their venom is to have the spirit bathed in honey. Let every part be saturated with meekness, gentleness, forbearance, and patience; and the most spiteful enemy will be disappointed in his endeavors to inflict a sting. We shall remain uninjured, while his venom returns to corrode his own malignant bosom; or, what is far better, the honey with which he comes in contact will neutralize his gall; the coals of forgiving love will dissolve his hatred, and the good returned for evil will overcome evil with good.

Communications.

PROVIDENCE, January 15th, 1844.

David Lee Child, New-York:

Sir:—We herewith transmit you the statement of John F. A. Calder, in regard to his treatment at the South; and we have undoubted proof of its correctness. Will you be kind enough to insert it in your paper of this week, and much oblige your abolition friends of Rhode Island.

SAMUEL LARNED, 2d, } Sec'ys.
AMARANCY PAINE, }

Mr. Editor:—Permit me, through your valuable columns, to give the following statement of facts, which took place at Norfolk, Va. and Charleston, S. C. Being an American born citizen, the treatment towards me has been most shameful. I left Boston about the 7th of April, 1843, on account of disappointment in business and other embarrassments. Since that time, I have been traveling South, intending to return to Boston and [illegible] my difficulty. My first visit was to Norfolk, Va. About the middle of September 1843, I arrived at the above place; about my fifth day in that city, I happened at the steamboat wharf, which plies between Norfolk and Portsmouth. I saw a negro man running at full speed, and a white man after him, with something in his hand. I took it to be a stone. The negro finding that to escape the punishment of his master, (Mr. Gray, the former owner of George Latimer,) was vain, he immediately plunged in the water. He went down the third time to rise no more. After remaining under the water some 15 minutes or more, some negro men began to plunge boat hooks in the water to find him. I then spoke, and said, if you use those hooks you will stick them into his body. I pointed to the bubbles of water at the other end of the dock, and had the body taken out of the water, and in a few moments there was collected, a number of people, among whom was Doctor Grannice. When the man was pronounced to be dead, I said, "Let me have hold of that man?" They did so. I then commenced operations upon the body. I found that there was still some life. After removing the man to a yard close at hand, I continued my course of operations in the presence of Dr. Grannice, and some hundred persons. After inflating the lungs of the man with a pressure of my own breath, the man spoke. His name was Peter, I think. He was then removed to a negro house close at hand, where his master, (Mr. Gray,) was at the time, noticing all my movements. After the man was so far recovered, in my mind, I recommended him to be taken to his residence, where care would be taken of him. The master then spoke, and said, "That is my negro, and I will get a cart and take him." I then said, "If you put that man on a cart, it will cause a reaction, and the man will die." I said it would be better to put him in a carriage, or some light wagon. Mr. Gray then made use of some very improper language upon the people of Boston and the North. After he left the house, there were several persons came in, among whom were several officers to arrest me as an abolitionist from the North. I was taken to the mayor's dwelling for examination. The mayor committed me for further examination. After trying some prisoners for slight offenses, I was brought before the mayor, amidst a thronged court-room, to consult as to the proper course to be taken to punish a supposed abolitionist. Some wished one course, some another: and my private letters and papers of advice, bills, and receipts, were examined before the court-room. But nothing being found to commit me any further, the mayor discharged me, with an order to leave the State, never to return. I then crossed the levee to Portsmouth, and walked to Suffolk as a sailor. This was my plan: to escape with my life from Suffolk, through Petersburg and other places, to Richmond, Va. where I had an opportunity to write a few lines to my friends. I then took passage to Charleston, in the schooner Intrepid, Captain Lewis. After a severe passage of two weeks, I arrived at Charleston on the 11th day of October, 1843, I remained there two or three weeks. In the early part of November, I was called upon by the captain of the guard house, and was asked if my name was Calder. I said, "Yes." He said he had a warrant for me. I asked him for what? [illegible] said it was not anything in Charleston, but for having conversation with the slave of Mr. Gray, of Norfolk. After a sh[illegible] was kept in the guard house 24 hours. [illegible] mitted to jail there, for the tr[illegible]xamination, I was committed [illegible] was detained in jail some five [illegible]tions in Norfolk, Va. I [illegible] and proper means to gain my liberty. I tried all honest [illegible] I wrote letters to the mayor, of w[illegible] all to no purpose. [illegible] true copies. After receiving the last, the following are [illegible] affidavit, I was called upon by a p[illegible]ers with a blank [illegible] through whom, and by giving bonds, and [illegible]er and others, of some little means, I gained my liberty, giving myself [illegible] dered to leave on a certain day; but being [illegible]d was or- [illegible] the means to obtain my passage, I undertook [illegible] prived of either to Savannah or Georgetown, but meeting with a walk friend of the city of Charleston, and remaining some days over my time, and no vessel for the North, I was obliged to disguise myself in the garb of a sailor, and try every possible means of reaching New-York or Boston; and hearing of a reward offered for me, I tried several vessels, but to no purpose, until my friend procured me a comfortable passage. I have, through a kind Providence and my friend, reached the North, where I hope I shall meet my friends of New-York and Boston, and shall make known some astounding facts which can be proved.

Very respectfully, yours,
JOHN F. A. CALDER.

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
CHARLESTON, Nov. 23d, 1843.

To John F. A. Calder:

Sir—Your communication of this date, has just been handed me; and in reply to your request to be allowed, under the custody of an officer, to leave the jail for the purpose of procuring a vessel to transmit you out of this and the southern States, not to return, I beg leave to say, that I have no objection to the request, upon first giving bonds to that effect, to the sheriff of Charleston district, and when that is consented, your request can go with effect; and when you have departed, I trust you will so far avoid any course of conduct, or conversation that will in the remotest manner compromise the deference which every citizen of the United States should feel and exhibit for the domestic institutions of a sister State.

Your obt. servt.
S. SCHMERLE, *Mayor.*

[A true copy, by S. Larned, 2d.]

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
November 27th, 1843.

To J. F. A. Calder, esq:

Sir—On Saturday last I received your communication of the 21st instant, with a very flattering testimonial on the part of the sailor, as to your good conduct while under his superintendence; and a letter from the mayor of Norfolk, in reply to my communication to him about you.

I have conferred with the city attorney as to the steps most proper to be taken between you and the corporation, and the contents of letters. By his advice, I propose, that if you desire to remain in Charleston, S. C. or south (of Mason and Dixon's line,) you will give the (requisite) security that I required—if you depart north (not to return) of that line in the United States, I shall be most happy, upon adequate assurances, (to be determined,) to discharge you upon certificate that the vessel to transmit you, is ready to sail.

Your obt. servt.
S. SCHMERLE, *Mayor.*

[A true copy, by S. Larned, 2d.]

MAYOR'S OFFICE, CHARLESTON, S. C.
November 28th, 1843.

The sheriff of Charleston district will discharge J. F. A. Calder, committed by me for vagrancy upon affidavit of ——, forwarded for criminal conversation with a slave of Mr. Gray, of Norfolk. Said J. F. A. Calder having been ordered off from Norfolk by the mayor of that town—and coming to Charleston without visible means, or satisfactory account whereby be supports himself,—and failing to give security for his good conduct, he is hereby discharged upon condition that he enter into bonds for the peace of South Carolina, as well as the city of Charleston; and that he will furthermore leave this State, not to return here, or any of the slaveholding States of the United States,—and charge the costs to the State, he being destitute.

S. SCHMERLE, *Mayor.*

S. B. IRVING.
[A true copy, by S. Larned, 2d.]

PROVIDENCE, R. I. Jan. 14th, 1844.

The undersigned, having heard the statement of J. F. A. Calder, as to the barbarous treatment inflicted upon him by the authorities and citizens of Norfolk, Va. and Charleston, S. C.; and having received full corroboration of the correctness from other and authentic sources, he has our confidence and sympathy.

We would furthermore call the attention of our fellow-citizens to the statement of our friend, as one exhibiting in a clear and unequivocal light, the unjust, barbarous, and atrocious character of *American slavery.*

William Aplin,
Amerancy Paine,
Samuel Asbley,
Frances A. Temple,
S. S. Ashley,
Ann Page,
Weltbea Bishop,
Susan Taber,
O. P. Orsborne,
Jacob Hopkins,
Charles Slocum,
Dunbar B. Harris,
Mary Smith,
Martin Robinson,
William M. Comstock,
D. W. Foster,
Hannah B. Shove,
Laura S. Capron,
Samuel Larned, 2d,
Mary Hathaway,
Olive Taber,
T. B. Sisson,
John Cutler,
Jeremiah A. Reynolds,
S. B. R. Foster,
A. R. James,
Saml. W. Wheeler,
Abby A. Lake.

WINDHAM COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At a meeting of the Windham County Anti-Slavery Society, in Plainfield, on the 2d instant, the following resolutions were introduced and passed without a dissenting voice:

Resolved, That inasmuch as the real slaveholding power in this country, is a corrupt and pro-slavery public sentiment, the responsibility for the continuance of the slave system rests chiefly on those classes which are mainly influential in forming the nation's public sentiment, and therefore the conductors of the public press, and yet more the occupants of the pulpits of the land, stand preeminent among those who are justly chargeable with the continued enslavement of our brethren in bonds.

Whereas, not all the Missionary, Bible, Tract Education, and other hundred societies of the land, nor all the exertions professedly made by the Church and church members of the country, can ever work out a full obedience to the mandate, "Preach the gospel throughout all the world unto every creature," till slavery is utterly abolished; Therefore,

Resolved, That the anti-slavery enterprise is the necessary pioneer of all enterprises, aiming to obey this command, and in so far as these throw their influence against that in any degree, they bar up their own way to success, and are unworthy of the support of the Christian public, and should be promptly discountenanced by all friends of Christian truth and human progress.

The above resolutions were spoken to by Messrs. C. M. Burleigh, G. S. White, Wm. Coe, Dean, of Norwich, and last, though not least, the eloquent and gigantic C. C. Burleigh.

The abolitionists of Windham county, I think, will look upon that meeting, as one of the best and most instructive that they have had for a long time, and yet they have had highly interesting ones for the last six months.

Yours, for the bondman,
JAMES B. WHITCOMB.

LETTER FROM S. S. FOSTER.

Your leading editorial of last week, headed "The Decennial Meeting," contains sentiments and statements which, as the author of the resolution which is the principal subject of remark, I cannot, with due regard to my own character, and to the interests of the anti-slavery cause, allow to pass unnoticed.

In your remarks on the general character of the meeting, I fully concur. I am happy to say, that, on no former occasion have I witnessed so much harmony of feeling, and brotherly affection, where there was so wide a difference of opinion on subjects deemed of vital importance to our cause. True, there were instances of unkind expressions, which I very much deprecated; but they were very rare, considering the entire freedom with which the policy of the different agents, editors, and prominent members of the society was discussed; and much, I am confident, was done at this meeting, to increase the confidence of the friends of the society in each other's uprightness of purpose, and to strengthen the bond of fraternal union.

But in speaking of the discussion on the resolution requiring a total withdrawal of countenance and support from pro-slavery sects and parties, you do the friends of that mode of anti-slavery action great injustice—unintentionally, I have no doubt. You impute to them sentiments which they do not hold, and language which, I am confident, none of them used. It is not true, as I understand you to represent, that they, or any of them, alledged, on that occasion, that he who, under any circumstances, holds connection with a pro-slavery sect or party, is necessarily "a rascal and a villain." Whenever these epithets were used, they were applied to the majorities in those bodies—to the men who give them their pro-slavery character—and not to the abolitionists, who, from a mistaken sense of duty, still continue their connection with them. (1.) There are persons connected with pro-slavery parties, whom the advocates of secession do not regard as "rascals and villains;" and among them are yourself, and our estimable friends, James and Lucretia Mott; but they think your influence would be greatly enhanced, if you held not the shadow of a connection with either whigs or Quakers. (2.) But can any one doubt the rascality and villany of those persons, who, professing to be democrats and Christians, give the respective parties to which they belong a pro-slavery character, and employ them to perpetuate the enslavement of their countrymen? (3.) You will yourself admit, I presume, that if anything done by depraved mortals can be rascally and villanous, it is holding men in slavery. I am sure you would think so, if you or yours were enslaved. (4.) Shall we, then, be censured for affirming that those bodies which employ their influence to support slavery, or refuse to aid in its overthrow, are made up of "rascals and villains?" But they are not all "rascals and villains!" Well, admitting that they are not, what then? Does it devolve on us—having found out that certain bodies claiming to be Christian, are engaged in a most rascally and villanous business—does it devolve on us, I say, to show that they are not all "rascals and villains?" Is it our business to be hunting up exceptions? Ought we not rather to employ our time in exposing the character of such bodies, in its true light, that the honest among them, if there be any such, may quit their company, and no longer fraternize with "rascals and villains," and endorse their characters before the world, as honest men, and Christians? When we speak of sects and parties, we of course do not mean to include every individual member, but the main body of those who constitute them. And we are always so understood, when speaking on other subjects. Christ was accustomed to say, "Wo unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" But I suppose, had some of our modern complainers been at his side, they would have objected to this "habit and manner of indiscriminate denunciation," that it "was founded in falsehood, and involved great and very irritating injustice"! (5.)

If the abolitionists who continue to support pro-slavery sects and parties, were perfectly conscious of being in the right, would they be disturbed by any general censures bestowed on those bodies? I never feel myself wronged, when foreigners denounce the American people as liars and hypocrites. (6.) But if I were connected with a mercantile house, a portion of whose capital was employed in the slave-trade, I might very possibly be irritated by an "indiscriminate denunciation" of that house. I presume I should want every one who alluded to it in terms of censure, to make me an exception. (7.)

You are incorrect in saying that, "as a further reason for maintaining this testimony of the society, it was said that it was common ground on which we could unite with the liberty party." The reason assigned, was this: "that it was the *true* ground, and therefore the *only* ground, on which *all* the abolitionists, of whatever party, could unite." (8.) I entirely concur in your remarks on the hypocrisy of a portion of the liberty party. The liberty-party man who continues to hold fellowship with a pro-slavery church or sect—who separates from the whigs and democrats at the ballot-box, on account of their immoralities, and at the same time sits with them at the communion table, such an individual, in my judgment, is a more dangerous enemy of the slave than either whig or democrat. "Judgment must begin at the house of God," said the apostle; and every man of sense can see the truth of the principle. If Joshua Leavitt, and his associates, will fellowship villany in the Church, so barefaced and atrocious that they cannot endure it in the State, it proves them to be either fools or knaves, neither of which can be abolitionists. It takes an honest and a tolerably consistent man, to make an abolitionist; and it is on such that we call to come out of their respective sects and parties. All others had better remain with the whigs and democrats, and their respective religious sects, where they properly belong. But instead of opposing the liberty party, as such, I would attend its meetings, and countenance and encourage whatever in it is right and true, and expose and *oppose* the wrong; and either convert and save to the cause those hypocritical and sham advocates of "come-out-ism," who still continue to borough in the dens of our pro-slavery religion, or drive them from the party, by the power of scorching rebuke. (9.) I am anxious to see the thorough-going abolitionists of the old society in the meetings of the liberty party, with their probes. Such a course will either purify or break up the party, either of which is preferable to the present state of things. My hope is, that the party, if thus tried, will bear the test; but if it cannot, the sooner this is shown, the better will it be for the cause. It is a mistake to suppose that hypocrites, and men grossly inconsistent, add strength to a party, whose object is reform. (10.) Like mud on our carriage-wheels, they increase the *weight* numerically of the party to which they are attached, but add nothing to its *strength.* They are rather an incumbrance, from which it is a favor to be relieved. It is not Gerrit Smith's eloquence that has given him such success in his native county; for eloquence has proved itself powerless before the pro-slavery sentiment of the country. But it is his truthfulness and consistency, and the strength and boldness of his positions.

I do not agree with you. (I speak of these objections to the resolution as yours, because, if my memory serves me, you were its principal opponent among the speakers) in saying that, "If it be a sin not to vote, and a sin to vote for the candidates set up by either the whig or the democratic party, it follows that there is no escape from sin and misery, except by joining the liberty party." If a man comes out from the whig or the democratic party, must he *necessarily* go into the liberty party? Are you, who advocate the divinity of human governments, in such a dilemma, that there are but *three* evils between which you can choose? I have always understood that human-government men, in theory, at least, were free to select their own candidates; and consequently, that there was no necessity of supporting either of the political parties. But if you are correct in your exposition of this matter, and there is no alternative but to support one of the three existing parties, and the liberty party is even worse than the whigs or the democrats, I see strong reasons for advocating non-resistance as an anti-slavery measure. (11.)

There is very much in the objections urged against this resolution, in which I cannot concur. You speak of it as a *test.* If you mean by this, a test of *membership* in the society, it is a mistake. The society has but one test of membership, and that is signing the constitution, and complying with its requisitions; and the adoption of this resolution, at the last annual meeting, was designed in no way to affect the standing of members in the society. But if you mean simply a test of consistent anti-slavery conduct, you are correct; and in this respect the resolution under consideration differs not at all from all others adopted by the society. But in that case, your objection, that it would "narrow the platform," falls to the ground. (12.)

Your comparison of this resolution with the demands of new organization, is an altogether forced analogy.—The two are as widely different as the gently swelling tide and the fierce mountain billow; and they proceed from motives quite as unlike as are the causes of these different natural phenomena. The seceders of 1840, you tell us, "demanded of Garrison and others that they should come out of the women's rights and non-resistant cause, or go out of the society." Does this resolution ask anybody to "go out of the society?" It differs not in this respect from any other resolution to which a minority of the society are opposed. It is simply an expression of the opinion of the majority, as to what course of action abolitionists ought to pursue. But further; on what ground was it that new organization demanded of Garrison to come out of the women's rights and non-resistant cause? Was it that this cause was *pro-slavery?* that it was the very "bulwark of slavery?" It will not be contended, I presume, that new organization ever promulgated the absurd dogma that to believe in the natural equality of the sexes, and the duty of forgiving our enemies, was to sustain slavery. Its sins and follies are very great, I know; but I have yet to learn that it ever seriously entertained such an idea. Where, then, is the analogy? But if James G. Birney, and his seceding associates, had really supposed that the women's rights and non-resistant cause was the main pillar on which the whole fabric of slavery rested—if they had been able to point to resolutions of numerous non-resistant societies, justifying slavery from the bible—and if the great body of the non-resistants had been the bitter and intolerant enemies of our enterprise, and the money paid into their treasuries had been employed to counteract the efforts of the abolitionists—and if this was done after ten years of faithful remonstrance from the friends of the slave—if, I say, such had been the position of the non-resistant associations, I think it would have been the duty of Mr. Birney and his friends to procure the adoption of a resolution, calling upon Mr. Garrison and his non-resistant coadjutors to leave their societies, and either organize new ones, carry on their cause without associations, or stand aloof from it altogether; but on no condition to affiliate with existing associations, which were employed to oppose the anti-slavery enterprise. Less than this they could not do, in fidelity to the cause. (13.)

But there is another point on which the analogy entirely fails. The new organizationists required of Mr. Garrison and the non-resistants to give up their *principles*—and principles, too, on a subject altogether foreign from that which we were associated to discuss—or to leave the society. But this resolution asks no one to give up any of his principles, but simply to abandon a course of action which has been shown to be prejudicial to the abolition cause. It leaves every one perfectly free to entertain and to advocate such sentiments as he may think proper. It only condemns fraternizing with man-thieves, and their accomplices and abettors, as a pro-slavery act.

You speak of this resolution as an act of persecution. I must confess, I am not sufficiently clear-sighted to discern in it anything of that nature. To resolve that we think it the duty of abolitionists to leave off supporting pro-slavery, seems to me, to say the least, a very harmless species of persecution. It is but a few weeks since, that you, as the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, bore a faithful testimony against my *practical* notions of the right of speech. Did I complain of persecution? I rather commended you for your fidelity to your own convictions of duty, and what you supposed to be the good of the cause. (14.)

Again, we are told that, "by the doctrine advanced on the part of those who advocated this resolution, the British abolitionists who consented to the apprenticeship system, were "rascals and villains." Well, admitting that they were, does that prove the propriety of supporting pro-slavery institutions? But where is the analogy in the two cases? The British abolitionists *submitted* to the apprenticeship system, as the last concession to the bleeding slave, which they could wring from the hands of arbitrary power—all the while demanding the full recognition of his rights. (15.) The opponents of this resolution propose, of their own free will and choice, to support the institutions on which the whole fabric of slavery rests—to fraternize with man-stealers, and those who legalize man-stealing—and to contribute of their money and influence to support the most inveterate enemies of the anti-slavery cause. You add, in this connection, "It might be asked, what *we* were, before we became abolitionists, and what come-out-ers were, before they thought of cutting their pro-slavery connections?" I answer, that "*we*" were *pro-slavery*, of course, "before we became abolitionists," and as such, were highly culpable; and that come-out-ers, after they became abolitionists, and "before they thought of cutting their pro-slavery connections," were ignorantly contributing of their influence to support slavery. Hence, our enterprise lingers as it does.

You tell us, "It was insisted, that if the society sanction the doctrine of this resolution, they were bound to go further, and include every association, connection, act, and thing, which directly or indirectly lends any support or countenance to slavery." Has not the society *already* done this, in general terms? I have always understood that the American Anti-Slavery Society had put the seal of its reprobation on everything which sustained slavery; and that it was a fundamental principle with abolitionists, that it could not be right, under any circumstances, to support a system fraught with such direful consequences to millions of our countrymen. (16.)

You ask, "Would the American Anti-Slavery Society, to the extent of its influence, rupture the tender, and in every possible view, comparatively innocent tie of religious sympathy, and spare the sordid dealer in the blood-nourished and blood-stained products of slave-labor?" I answer, the American Anti-Slavery Society, if true to its trust, will never spare the *sordid* dealer in the blood-stained products of slave-labor; and you, as the organ of the society, are bound to see that it is thus true. But is the tie of religious sympathy with the enslavers of more than two and a half millions of the American people, comparatively innocent? To enter into mercantile relations with man-stealers, under any circumstances, is, to say the least, of doubtful propriety; and to do this from *sordid* motives, is unquestionably wrong; but to sit at the communion table with such men—to recognize them as followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, and to enter with them into associations for the promotion of His gospel and kingdom—this seems to me not to be a "*comparatively* innocent" act! I know of nothing so well calculated to strengthen the hands of the wicked, as recognizing them as good men. (17.)

You say again, "By the reasoning of the author and advocates of this resolution, every man, woman, and child, who use a pinch of salt, is a Florida slave-catcher." What is that reasoning, I would like to know, from which you deduce this alarming conclusion? (18.) If I understand it, it is simply this. To strengthen the hands of the opponents of abolition, is to support slavery. To fraternize with pro-slavery sects and parties—to contribute to them of our money—to recognize them as honorable men and Christians, or to place them in power—is to strengthen the hands of the opponents of abolition. Therefore, they who thus fraternize and co-operate with pro-slavery sects and parties, support slavery. Thus stated, do you object to the reasoning? I presume not. (19.) Your only alternative, then, is to dispute our premises, if you would avoid our conclusions. But surely you cannot seriously doubt that contributing money to the opponents of abolition, (except as beggars,) endorsing their character as Christians, by entering into church relations with them, or placing them in office, is to strengthen their power to do us harm. No support given to pro-slavery sects and parties, is like that which comes from abolitionists; but to use paper made from slave-grown cotton, for anti-slavery purposes, when no other can be obtained, is not to support slavery. At least, so it appears to me. But if I thought with you, that there were "none who more directly or powerfully support slavery," than those who use the products of slave labor, I would, in the first place, wash my own hands clean in this matter, and then call upon *you*, in your own words, to "fulminate your anathemas against the *consumers* of these products." (20.)

There are several other points in this discussion, to which I intended to refer; but having already extended my remarks far beyond my original design, I will here take leave of the subject for the present, in hope that the truth will yet make you, what it has already made me, a genuine come-out-er.

With confidence and esteem,
I remain your friend and coadjutor,
S. S. FOSTER.

P. S. In another column of the same paper, I notice a fraction of an article from the Liberty Press, relating to Abby Kelley, followed by some remarks of your own, in which you complain that she has not contradicted a groundless and unjust statement in regard to yourself, which the writer charges her with having made at the Winfield convention. I have had no opportunity to speak with Miss Kelley on the subject; but I presume I may safely say that her reasons for not contradicting this statement, were the same that would have prevented her from contradicting it, had it been made in Bennett's Herald, instead of the Liberty Press. That paper has already too far sacrificed its reputation for truth, to make it necessary to contradict any of its falsehoods. The piece from which you take this extract, is a tissue of the grossest misrepresentation, falsehood, and personal abuse, which degrades both the writer and the editor beneath an honorable notice, especially when it is recollected that the article was inserted over a fictitious signature—the coward author not thinking it prudent to hazard his reputation for veracity on the truth of his statements.

I was present on the occasion referred to by the correspondent of the Press, and heard Miss K.'s speech; and seldom has it been my privilege to listen to a more impartial, clear, and judicious statement of the causes of the existing divisions among the abolitionists of this State, and the measures necessary to a re-union. Her allusion to yourself was in the most respectful terms. She stated, in substance, that she disapproved of the present course of the Standard, and had ceased to procure subscribers for it—a fact with which you were well acquainted. Thereupon, a person in the assembly inquired of her if she had not, within two days, asked Deacon Leach to subscribe for it. Forgetting, for the moment, the circumstances of the case, she replied that she thought not, and inquired if it was not the Liberator. She then remarked, that from a correspondence which she had recently seen, (referring to your correspondence with the executive committee, which has since appeared in the Standard,) she was inclined to think the difference between you and herself might be merely in the mode of stating your views; in which case, she might hereafter support the Standard. The facts in regard to the case of Deacon Leach, from which the writer *fabricates* the charge of falsehood, were briefly these. Miss K. requested the deacon to subscribe for the Liberator. He objected, on the ground that his neighbor took that paper, and he wanted a different one, for the purpose of an exchange; and signified his intention to take the Liberty Press. Miss Kelley then recommended the Standard, as preferable to the Press.

S. S. F.

(1.) Mr. Foster admits that the epithets quoted by us, were used, and the only question is, to whom were they applied? We understood them to be applied to the pro-slavery *parties* and *sects;* and further, that all parties and sects were held by the advocates of the *come-out-er* resolution, to be pro-slavery, if they (meaning of course the majority,) were not anti-slavery; and that every individual who remained in connection with them, or in other words, did not "withdraw all fellowship and support from them," is obnoxious to the charge of supporting slavery, and is "a rascal and a villain." We think we cannot be mistaken on this point, because the above definition and inference were stated, and repeated, as one of the grounds on which the argument in opposition to the resolution rested. If we were mistaken in this view, (and that was not intimated during the debate, or the meeting,) then of course the reasoning fails. But if this ground be abandoned, we do not see what remains, on which *come-out-ism*, as an imperative and universal duty of abolitionists, can stand. Observe that we say *universal* duty, because the question of individual duty, resulting from special circumstances, and conscientious convictions, will always remain for each individual to consider and decide for himself.

(2.) That influence would not be enhanced by making professions not founded upon conviction. The greatest of errors is to be insincere. For all other errors there is hope from increased light; but increased light brings no hope for this.

(3.) Agreed; but suppose we employ them to the extent of our power, (and this extent, if we are uncompromising and persevering, is ever more and more,) to overthrow slavery?

(4.) Certainly, but remember, that there may be *prima facie* offenders, of every kind and degree, for whom the just, humane, and charitable, even when suffering the extremest wrong at their hands, will offer up the petition, "Father forgive them, they *know not* what they do"!

(5.) In answer to this, we would say that we do not consider it "our business to be hunting up exceptions;" but we do consider it our business to do justice always, whether it be demanded or not, to individuals, and to bodies of men, according to our best knowledge and belief, as nearly as the imperfection of human language will admit. According to Addison, Pleasure and Pain, when they undertook to divide mankind between them, "found that there was no person so vicious, who had not some good in him, nor any so virtuous, who had not in him some evil." The Scythian taught his sons how to break a bundle of sticks by separating them. By applying anathemas indiscriminately, we make those who are in any degree friendly, less so, and in this manner incline them more to adhere to our enemies; whereas, if we discriminate as well as we can between good and bad individuals of societies, and between good and bad qualities of individuals, we encourage the former and shame the latter; and thus take the most effectual method of cherishing and strengthening the good, and reclaiming the bad. If our object be to detach the good, and to break their association with the evil, the true policy is to be strictly just in the outset, and not wait for them to take up, in complaining or retaliating, time in which they might have been reconciled to us. As to the words of Jesus, we suppose that he spoke according to his own knowledge; for if there had been "ten righteous men," he would have excepted them, or if a righteous Lot, he would have saved him.

(6.) Aye, but have you never felt a thrill of pleasure and of honest pride, at the exception which Daniel O'Connell, and other distinguished persons of Europe, in speaking or writing of America, make of abolitionists?

(7.) Suppose, however, that a partner in a mercantile house had refused any concern in a slave branch of the business, (and some such there have been,) and by this testimony, and by constantly exerting his influence, strove to withdraw his associates from the same; would you then think that it comported with justice, or common sense, to denounce them all alike?

(8.) Whatever we may have said on this part of the subject, we never had a suspicion that the ground was proposed merely, or primarily from motives of policy. We had a better opinion of every person present at our meeting, than to indulge such a thought. All that we meant to say, was, that it was argued that one of the effects would be to afford common ground for a reunion of abolitionists.

(9.) Yes, friend, and so would we; but is there in this no inconsistency with the *come-out* creed? Why not eschew liberty party, or quit it if you were of it, in the same manner as you would any other party and sect, if you believed it embraced all the malignant, and in *effect*, pro-slavery spirit, which you, as well as ourself, think inheres in "new organization?"

(10.) Undoubtedly.

(11.) Mr. Foster mistakes us. We spoke of the principles of the liberty party, not of our own. He will not deny that *they* hold it as much the duty of abolitionists to unite with them, as to separate from whigs and democrats. *We* believe that one may be a good abolitionist, and have nothing to do with either.

(12.) We can perceive no substantial difference between a test of membership and a test of anti-slavery consistency. For who would remain in an association, working according to his honest views of right and duty, and with his best ability, if he is to have the influence of his labors impaired by the official ban of the body of his associates? Friend Foster is aware that his conclusion, as well as our own, was, that no man who was not a come-out-er, could consistently or honestly edit the Standard, if the society had adhered to the declaration of the last anniversary. Would there have been nothing like test in this? He is aware that we admitted that we could not stand a moment before our associates in that capacity, had we not frankly said, before accepting the office, that we could not carry out that declaration. We believe, moreover, that it was very apparent to all, that if the declaration were reaffirmed, we could do no less than resign forthwith.

(13.) In point of fact, they did declare, again and again, in public and private, that *non-resistant* and *women's rights men*, were doing great harm to the cause, and were, in effect, pro-slavery. Certainly they did not maintain that non-resistants and women were *the* bulwark of slavery; but if, in their estimation, those classes gave any support, aid, or comfort to slavery, did not that bring them, (without any nice determination of the degree thereof,) within the principle of *come-out-ism?* Is it not a matter of weekly occurrence, that those who refuse to go to the polls and vote, are denounced as recreant to the cause of the slave—as "the do-nothing-party," &c.

(14.) If we thought we could hasten most the emancipation of slaves, by fraternizing with man-thieves in everything except their man-stealing, we should not hesitate to do so. Cassius M. Clay continues to hold slaves because he thinks he can do more good to the cause of freedom and humanity, by continuing in that relation, than by immediately abandoning it. We think he is mistaken; nevertheless, we do not condemn him, because we are not competent to judge for a man who is exposed every day to assassination by his neighbors, and wishes not to widen the breach between him and them, so long as there is hope of doing them good. God forbid that we should pronounce him "a rascal and a villain."

(15.) It is one thing, to differ and to discuss with individuals, and another, to be disavowed by a powerful society, especially if one desires to labor in, and for that society. Abolitionists, losing caste, as they have with other bodies of men, have peculiar need of the sympathy and friendship of their own association.

(16.) Abolitionists who remain in pro-slavery parties and sects, ought all the while to bear a consistent and constant testimony against them, submitting to their inaction, or their wrong action, as an inevitable evil, but always protesting and demanding the full recognition of the rights of man.

(17.) Certainly, but it is begging the question, to say that there is but one way of destroying the system; but one way of fighting the foe; and that that one is to take the position most distant from him. But observe, that we do not condemn the taking of such a position. Perhaps some persons, in doing so, may carry by their name and example, a whole company or regiment with them. The encampment on *Mons Sacer* was necessarily an extraordinary movement of the people. The *ordinary* sphere of the labor of their instructers and leaders, was the comitia and the forum.

(18.) We admit that the Church has more power to affect the institution of slavery, than the dealers in slave produce, or the coastwise slave-traders; but we cannot admit that individuals of the clergy and churches are usually as guilty as the slave-dealers. The wickedness is not generally brought home to them in so palpable a manner. But we defend neither; we join in the pro-slavery of neither, but we wish to take our own way of correcting both.

(19.) Whoever consumes salt, pays a tax to the government of the United States; whoever pays such tax, supports that government, its army and navy; that government, its army and navy, have been, and are, employed in catching, or more properly, kidnapping self-emancipated slaves: therefore, every consumer of salt in the United States is a kidnapper. This is not our reasoning, but a specimen of come-out reasoning. *We* put it as a *reductio ad absurdum.*

(20.) The principles of abolitionists teach them to "fraternize" with all men, slaveholders included; to give their sympathy and assistance to the lowest and the guiltiest, but they are not to partake of their sins; they are to enlighten, reprove, and reform sinners. This is the meaning of the much-quoted, and perverted text, "What communion hath Christ with Belial." We may remain in communion with sinners, while we are enlightening, rebuking, and reforming them. This is the grand characteristic of the age. Look at the temperance reform; look at the literature, which has succeeded in the public favor—the aristocratic works of Sir Walter Scott. Pity, sympathy, redress, and redemption, for the lowly, the suffering, and the guilty, form the essence and spirit of the new popular literature. Jesus was stigmatized as "the friend of publicans and sinners."

(21.) We use the products of slave-labor without scruple, when we cannot get those of free, to which we always give a preference. There was a time when we attempted *teetotalism* in this behalf, but we found it so troublesome and impracticable that we gave it up. The attempt was abandoned in England. It cannot, as Mr. Garrison has remarked, be carried out without rejecting free produce along with slave produce, because they are mixed up in the fabrics of all the great manufacturing nations. But we see not how *come-out-ers* can be consistent, without totally renouncing the use of slave-labor products. And as we have often said before, without going out of the country, where they cannot remain without paying taxes to a slave oligarchy, and its government, and helping to overawe by their presence and arms, the spirit of just resistance in the slaves.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JAN'Y. 25, 1844.

OUR REPUTATION IN EUROPE.

MR. DEWEY'S LECTURE.

(*Concluded.*)

While the hypocritical charge of "putting back emancipation," has been made against abolitionists by slaveholders in the South, and re-echoed by reverend and flippant apologists of slavery in the North, both uttering cant and invective without the slightest attempt at proof, abolitionists have been accumulating, without seeking it, direct and undeniable evidence of the efficacy of their labors. Their direct aim has never been to effect emancipation in detail, but to inform and convince the people of the enormous guilt and infamy of the system of American slavery. From the character of their operations, results must necessarily be slow, but vast and universal, like chemical change, or vegetable growth produced by a genial warmth of the whole atmosphere. Yet we have not been left without the cheering influence of positive and particular instances of success. A considerable number of southern slaveholders have emancipated their bondmen, candidly and gratefully acknowledging their obligations to abolitionists for the information and admonitions, by which they were first awakened to a sense of their iniquity. The authentic cases of this kind, are those of the Rev. Drs. *Nelson* and *Lafon*, of Missouri; Messrs. *Birney* and *Thome*, of Kentucky; the Rev. Dr. *Brisbane*, and the Rev. Mr. *Mott*, of South Carolina; and Mrs. Gerrit Smith, formerly of Maryland. Each of these emancipated all their slaves, and some of them, at great expense, and in spite of serious obstacles, re-purchased and manumitted slaves whom they had sold. There have been other instances, of which our information is less full and authentic. We may add, that lately, northern citizens, who, as heirs or creditors, have become the possessors of slaves have immediately set them free, in consequence of the juster views of slavery, disseminated by abolitionists. Now, when we consider the great importance attached by Him, whose servant Dr. Dewey is called, to the simple act of giving a cup of water in His name, will any true disciple say, that "the day of small things" is to be despised. These examples are operating like the gentle dew over the entire surface of the southern country, and flowers and fruit will in due time, display their wealth and beauty.

But the greatest and loveliest labor of abolitionists has been the removal in a great degree, of the cruel and crushing prejudice against the free colored people in the North. They have for several years, begun to be treated according to character, and not according to complexion. They are admitted into refined and virtuous society; colleges and seminaries, are *opened* to them; they are engaging in lucrative and honorable pursuits and professions, they are rarely denied the best accommodations and comforts on the road and in public houses; oppressive and humiliating legal distinctions have been abolished with the general assent, and applause of the community. This is a moral resurrection. It is the work of abolitionists, and they regard it with such heartfelt joy and pride, as the trump of fame and the plumed troop, and splendid trophies of the triumphant warrior, never did and never can inspire. Is it not an amiable office for a minister of mercy and charity, to blight this innocent pleasure, to deride our rejoicing over a rescued race, and damp a disinterested ardor for the redemption and fraternization of mankind? For the contempt with which Dr. Dewey regards the humble efforts of abolitionists, continued, though they have been, with unwearied perseverence during ten years, while *he* has done next to nothing, we care little. But when he endorses that choicest, blackest libel of the slave-breeders, contained in the following passage, we confess that we do feel indignant.

"Emancipation has taken place, (in the free States,) yet the free blacks are worse off than the slaves of the South, not being so well clothed, fed, or so happy."

This proposition, like other wholesale and inhuman assertions, is announced as peremptorily as a dogma of Mahomet. The doctor adduces no fact or argument to sustain it. We ask him for the proof. Meantime we remind (perhaps *inform*) him that the plantation slaves, and in a majority of instances, house slaves, have no beds, that the former have no household furniture except an iron pot and a wooden spoon, or other rude utensils of their own manufacture; that their huts are of the rudest description, generally built by themselves, in the night, with no materials but those from the clay-pit and forest, brought on their backs and in their hands; that the only covering when they lie down, in the coldest weather, is a miserable coarse and scanty horse-blanket, renewed once in two or three years, and serving also for a great-coat in the day time; and that the usual and only allowance of food, is a peck of *light* southern corn per week, which they must grind by hand, and bake for supper, and for a field breakfast and dinner on the following day, before their sleep, be their work continued in the field, in the barn, and the cotton house, ever so late. Moreover the ordinary allowance for the entire clothing and subsistence of a slave, is *fifteen* to *twenty* dollars a year. Now, it is well known that no pauper is maintained in the free States, for less than *fifty* to one *hundred* dollars per annum. In Massachusetts, the average is *seventy-five* dollars. The poor-houses of the free States are always open to the colored people. If their "physical condition" were worse than that of the slaves, would they not resort very generally to the public provision for paupers? This would be inevitable; and their omitting to do so, may be considered conclusive evidence that the amount of necessaries, comforts, conveniencies, and luxuries, that each adult enjoys, *exceeds* the average above-mentioned. There is not a large proportion of blacks in our almshouses. As an evidence of this, and at the same time, of the general comfort of the free colored people of the North, we state that when an investigation took place, some six years ago, into their condition in the city and county of Philadelphia, it was found that their taxes (paid for the support of the poor, amounted to $500) more than was expended on the colored poor! These are facts. Has Dr. Dewey supported one of his cruel assertions with anything like them. And yet the burden of proof is on him! But we leave this topic, without dwelling upon (what Dr. Dewey has not thought worth mentioning,) the pleasures of science, art, and literature; of civilized and intellectual intercourse, manners, and conversation, of a *safe home* and domestic relations, of benevolent and literary associations, of imagination, memory, and *hope*, of all which the slave is nearly as much deprived as if chained for life, to the floor of a dark dungeon. But these circumstances were not sufficiently important to attract the attention of Dr. Dewey, and he confined his observation to the slave's "physical condition." We are happy to see that an accomplished fellow-citizen of color, [Dr. McCune Smith,] has challenged the doctor to sustain in a public debate with him, the proposition we have thus briefly and imperfectly noticed. If the reverend doctor accepts the challenge, he will learn a great deal.

There is scarcely a proposition throughout the column and a half on slavery, that is not as loose and as hardy as the one last quoted, but it would occupy a dozen entire Standards to treat of them all as we could wish. We can only give specimens.

Dr. Dewey does not believe in the colonization society, yet he believes in colonization. He would, however, choose "the foot of the Rocky Mountains," on this side or the other. And does he think that the negroes would fare better than the Indians? In fact the doctor admits, by implication, that colonization of the entire race, anywhere, is impracticable. But then the two races cannot live together as equals, for some cause which the doctor is too dainty to express; but says, darkly, that it is in Jefferson's "*fourteenth query*" in the Notes on Virginia! This is charming! Is not this truly worthy of grave men on an issue involving the peace of an empire, and the rights, the freedom, the improvement, the happiness, the lives of millions of immortal beings? The whole is to turn on Jefferson's "fourteenth query," which this dandy of the divinity schools is too nice to name! However, he does get out the corollary, that "amalgamation is impossible." Do Dr. Dewey's Christian morals teach that a thing cannot be done legitimately, when he meets in every walk to his "Church of the Messiah," the Messiah both of "bond and free"—unquestionable evidence that it is done illegitimately all around him. The doctor afterwards eases off a little on this part of the subject.

> "The alleged success of West India emancipation, if it existed, the speaker accounted for from the overwhelming preponderance and ascendency in numbers of the colored race, which admitted of the formation of a public opinion there, and the establishment of a standard of honor, so that the clans might rise. *Honorable intermarriage exists in such a state of society.*"

The great ground on which southern men have excused themselves for continuing slavery, instead of imitating the example of the northern States, has always been the "overwhelming number" of their slaves! But we let that pass, and ask Dr. Dewey what has now become of Mr. Jefferson's "fourteenth query?"

The doctor describes the slave as the most cheerful and contented toiler in the world. To hear the doctor, one would marvel, not merely that slaves run away to Canada, but that the doctor does not run away to slavery.

"He (the slave) sees around him no famishing children. [Perhaps they have been sold to the speculators.] Food to eat, raiment to wear, a house to live in, provision for his old age, medicine and attendance for his sick—all this is secured to him by the very condition of his servitude." And what is this "condition?" This condition is, that it is profitable to the masters to treat their slaves well. But how does this apply to aged and infirm slaves whose work is done? It is then *profitable* to have them *die!*

When he comes to descant on the merits of the masters, and their sufferings for the sake of their slaves, he says:

"Why, the situation of the southern planters, good sirs, is not such an enviable one; full of anxieties is he, full of cares, often, tending upon the sick, providing for the *improvident!*" How can he call slaves "improvident," when he has set it forth as their peculiar happiness to have every thing provided for them, and to be thus relieved from care and anxiety?

The doctor says, "Slavery is not a *malum per se*, but a *malum prohibitum*, prohibited in the long run by expediency, prohibited by our general *moral* sentiments!"

He sets up an analogy betwixt the selling of a slave, and the binding of an apprentice. To put the provident, tender, and disinterested care and forecast of a father upon a level with the cupidity of the man-stealer and the slave-breeder, required the hardihood of a doctor of divinity.

Rien n'egale en fureur, en monstrueux caprices,
Une fausse vertu, qui s'abandonne aux vices.

MR. BEARDSLEY'S SPEECH.

Having been favored by this gentleman with a fuller report than we had before seen, of his remarks on the right of petition, we have inserted it entire, as one of the facts, marking the commencement of a new era in the struggle for the rights of man, and for the realization of the Declaration of Independence. We feel deep humiliation that we should have felt impelled to express gratitude to an American legislator, for such a speech as this. Yet we did feel that sentiment, we expressed it, and we feel no disposition to take it back. But we must not permit the speech to go forth in these columns, without some brief observations.

He assumes that Congress have a right to deny a reception to a petition, whose object is unconstitutional, in the same manner as a judicial court may refuse to take cognizance of a case not within its jurisdiction. Now, did anybody ever hear of a judicial court deciding not to take jurisdiction of a case brought before it, without *hearing* the writ, *examining* the pleadings, and listening to the arguments and precedents offered by the parties? But what has Congress done in the matter of the people's petitions, and what does Mr. Beardsley propose that they should do? *Hear* the petitions? No; the grand object of refusing to *receive* petitions, is to prevent their being *heard*, either by reading, printing, or referring! Every other object which they have in view, could be obtained as well after reception, as before.

Again, the analogy between Congress and a legal tribunal, wholly fails. The former has no discretion, whether to take or refuse jurisdiction, but must do one or the other, in obedience to law, and can grant no remedy, except in the form prescribed by law. But Congress is untrammeled; and being informed substantially of the grievances of the people, can vary the remedy at their pleasure, so as to meet the wants and wishes of their constituents. And even if they should find that they have no power to grant the prayer of a petition, they have authority to propose to the people to enlarge their jurisdiction. Congress is, by the Constitution, a perpetual *convention* for preparing and proposing amendments to the Constitution.

Besides, there is great difference of opinion as to what is and what is not constitutional. A large portion of the members of Congress consider a protective tariff unconstitutional. A majority of both branches have decided that it would be unconstitutional to pass a law stopping Sunday mails. Some think it unconstitutional to pass bankrupt laws; to annex to this Union any foreign territory; to remove Indians, in violation of treaties; to employ our army and navy in protecting the slave-trade, or in catching runaway slaves, or to maintain guards, constables, and prisons, for arresting and detaining slaves, or pretended slaves, in the District of Columbia; or to *license* the slave-trade in that district. If, then, a majority of Congress happened to concur in the opinion that a protective tariff is unconstitutional, it would follow, from Mr. Beardsley's doctrine, that they would have no right to hear the representations and prayers of any of the people who are of an opposite opinion. And so of every other subject. Let this tyrannical principle be understood and carried out in practice, and the government will speedily come to an end, and ought to.

Mr. Beardsley cannot wholly divest himself of the non-commitalism characteristic of public men in America, and especially in the State of New-York. He has not made up his mind, whether Congress has authority to prohibit the American slave-trade; nor therefore, whether our petitions, praying for such prohibition, *ought* to be shut out from our Hall, where our servants ought to do our business, or whether they ought to be admitted! We have never seen anything parallel to this, in any distinguished public man, except the veto of John Tyler, on the ground that he had not had time to determine whether he could sign a bill or not, though the subject had been before Congress ten years!

But the power to abolish the American slave-trade is conferred in the same words, in virtue of which Congress *did* abolish the *African* slave-trade, viz:

> "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

Congress has abolished the African slave-trade, and made it piracy; and has prohibited all trade whatsover with the Indians, except under a special license from the President. Can Mr. Beardsley so far depart from his non-commital position, as to inform us why, if Congress have prohibitory power under the first and last clauses of this section, they have no such power under the middle one? Or why he doubts that they possess such power?

Mr. Beardsley speaks of the right of petition, and so does *the base Albany Argus*, (in trimming its sails to the late change of the congressional *wind*,) as a "great," "essential," "vital," "inalienable," "inextinguishable right," and yet they declare their unmitigated hostility and contempt of the object of petitions which pray, among other things, that the *right of petition* may no longer be denied to three millions of Americans! They both know that if an individual of those millions should rise at midnight from the straw or the naked ground on which he reposes his scarred and weary limbs, and, appropriating a part of his few hours of respite from the remorseless lash, should learn by the light of embers, and in perpetual fear of the cruel ruffians called "patrollers," to read and write the letters of the alphabet, and should be able, after years of painful terrors and vigils, to write the story of his unutterable wrongs, it would be death, instant death to offer it to the Congress of this *republic*. O, shame, shame! Talk of the Inquisition? It was nowhere so sanguinary and summary as the slaveholding tyranny, aided by the northern *Swiss*, in these United States!

CASE OF AMELIA NORMAN.

This was one of the most important and remarkable judicial investigations that we have ever witnessed. In the progress of it, the culprit and the accuser *changed places*. *She* was acquitted with enthusiastic and irrepressible applause, shaking the building and re-echoed from the streets; *he* fearing for his worthless life, had fled from the court-house and the city. It was a case of diabolical seduction, and brutal abandonment of the ruined mother and the innocent child. Although evidence was *excluded* to the utmost legal extent, there was no doubt left on any impartial mind, that the same villain had been the destroyer of the peace, the honor, and in fact, the life of at least half a dozen other young and confiding females, belonging to the poor and middling classes. Abhorred vampyre! destructive beast! whom the laws permit to go up and down, seeking whom he may devour, but on whom the people have fixed the mark of Cain. It is idle and foolish to utter jeremiads about the upsetting of "law and order." To have convicted Amelia Norman, a heroic woman, no prostitute, but the victim of the *vilest of prostitutes*, would have been worse than a mob, and no one hates mobs worse than we.

Let revolution come in any shape, rather than permit a cruel and insatiate monster to destroy the fairest and dearest hopes of the country, and of the race of man. Such was the spirit awakened in that jury, that when the hired counsel of the vile accuser appealed to them as fathers of *sons*, as well as *daughters*, declaring, (and to some extent he probably *knew*,) that there were *twelve thousand* girls in this city with a like history of wrongs, and that, in all these cases, there was another party in the bosoms of the families of the city, and that their sons (if there should be an acquittal) would be brought home at twilight, expiring with ghastly wounds—there was not we believe, one juror in the box, who did not say in his heart: "Be it so: Let son of mine, if so base, perish, rather than live the disgrace of the mother who bore him, the stigma of his family, the curse and scourge of society, and the human race."

CABINET MOVEMENTS.

Henry A. Wise has been nominated to be *Minister Plenipotentiary* to Brazil. Why should public expense be increased in compliment to such a man? It would be bad enough for the patron of "loafers," the would-be rifler of Mexican churches, to succeed rejected Proffit, a man *less* bad, as simple chargé. What say you, Messrs. Senators?

Mr. *Spencer's* nomination is laid on the table. Com. Stewart or Capt. *Stockton*, is expected to succeed Henshaw. *Upshur* it is thought will be sent to France. This looks as if he despaired of *taking Texas* anyhow.

Daniel Webster, it is said, is about to return to the cabinet for the special purpose of negotiating with the coming envoy of Great Britain, the difficult *northwestern* boundary affair. John Tyler can do nothing better than this, either for himself, (which we would respectfully put *first*,) or for his country. Nothing can be more fit. None have regretted more than we, what we regarded as wrong and unworthy in Mr. Webster, or have ever given him a more hearty applause and support in all that was great and right.

REDUCTION OF POSTAGE.—The legislature of New-York has passed unanimously, resolutions in favor of reduction of postage.

GOOD NEWS.—Mr. Merrick, of the Senate, has reported a bill with the following rates of postage:

A single letter *one hundred miles*,	3 *cents*,
" *over* " "	10 *cents*,
Newspaper, *within the county*,	*free*,
Under one hundred miles,	*half a cent*,
Over " "	*one cent*.

☞ Our readers are referred to the narrative of Mr. *Calder*, on second page, for the newest specimen of the meanness and malignity of slaveholders.

☞ We are requested to state that one hundred dollars of the amount collected at the Decennial meeting, was handed over to the general fund, without the names of the individual donors. Consequently, no acknowledgment could be made, except in the aggregate.

☞ The treasurer has received from the Sabbath-School, in Reading, South Parish, Mass. five dollars, for Hiram Wilson, of the Canada mission.

ERRATA.—We were made to say, last week, that "one thousand slaves, worth $3,000,000, were annually brought to premature decay and death, on the sugar plantations of the United States." It should have read, three thousand slaves, worth $1,500,000, &c.

In remarks on Mr. Rhett's speech, in the same paper, for "panderer," read *pander*.

Anti-Slavery Items.

A fair specimen of southern insolence is shown in the report of Mr. Campbell, of South Carolina, on the petition presented by Mr. Giddings for a revision of the laws of the District of Columbia. Mr. C. reported a resolution that the clerk be directed to return the petition to the gentleman who presented it, and this resolution was adopted by a vote of 116 to 83. Some of the laws of the district are absolutely infamous, and a petition for the revision should be respectfully received and *granted*. The insolence of this procedure is infinitely worse than the gag-rule.—*Lowell Jour.*

A NEW ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT.—At Housatonicville, in this State, on the first instant, some of the inhabitants organized a new association called the "Anti-Slavery Union," which takes for its motto the words, "Liberty and Union." It is to have no connection with any of the anti-slavery societies now in existence, and its principal object (as we learn from the Stockbridge Visitor) will be to "investigate the subject of slavery in its bearings upon the prosperity, the politics, the morals, and the religion of the country, and likewise its influence upon education and the arts," and to spread before the public from time to time, the result of such investigations, by means of the press and public lectures; the members professing to believe that "a course of action is possible, on which the whole influence of the North can be brought to bear against the system of slavery, without interfering with the rights of the South, without the destruction of the constitution, and without the organization of a political party for that especial purpose."

AN HONORABLE LIFE.—Mr. Jared Smith, colored barber, died at Wilmington, Del. on the 9th ult. aged about 60 years. He was a man of exemplary character and strict integrity—purchased his and his wife's freedom—by industry, punctuality and care, he lived snugly, comfortably, and has left two houses, besides money and personal estate.

IS IT SO?—In a late number of your widely circulated paper, I read the following: "Let us look at this great nation, consisting of seventeen millions of inhabitants, prosperous, peaceful, happy, free, powerful and respectable."

The extract is from Dr. Dewey's eloquent lecture on "American morals and manners," delivered at the Broadway Tabernacle, January 9th. In the speech of one of our eminent statesmen, pronounced within three months, I noticed that he alluded to "twenty millions of inhabitants, happy and free," or something to that effect. Now, gentlemen, why will our orators use such rhetorical flourishes, as some southern orator called the phrases in the Declaration of Independence, where Jefferson, its author, speaks of all men being created equal, &c. It appears to me, with deference to Rev. Dr. Dewey, that such exaggeration is wholly out of place in a lecture vindicating "American morals and manners." The seventeen millions of "free" and "happy" Americans include nearly three millions of our countrymen in chains! We know it—England knows it—the world knows it. Let us leave off vaporing, then; and if we will swell the number of the people of this great country, let us speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. For example—"Let us look at this great nation, consisting of fourteen millions of white inhabitants—prosperous, peaceful, happy, free, powerful and respectable (if you will), and three millions of black inhabitants, most of them in bondage—poor, distressed, miserable slaves, weak and despised."—*N. Y. Com. Adv.*

CASSIUS M. CLAY.—An interesting speech is published in the Lexington Observer, which was delivered by this gentleman at an *annexation* meeting, where R. M. Johnson presided. Mr. Clay opposed annexation.

AN ITEM FOR DR. DEWEY.—A writer in the Christian World, gives an interesting account of the condition of the Massachusetts State prison under its excellent warden, Mr. Robinson. He states the following fact:—

"There were several colored men in the prison, and among them *one slave*, who escaped some years ago from bondage. He was committed for a petty theft, and he says he had much rather remain there, than ever again be reduced to slavery! He thinks himself fortunate in exchanging *Southern oppression for a Northern prison!* He fares better, has less labor to perform, *and is not liable to be sold to pay his jail fees!*

It is well known that the southern States do not punish slaves by sending them to their penitentiaries, because, if they did, they would commit crimes on purpose to be sent there!

An *Anti-Slavery Fair*, was held at Upton, Massachusetts, last week. Wendell Phillips, and Frederic Douglas delivered addresses.

Congress.

SENATE, MONDAY, January 15.

Several petitions for a reduction of postage, were presented.

After an executive session of some length, in which it is understood the nomination of Mr. Henshaw, as Secretary of the Navy, was rejected, the Senate adjourned.

[Mr. Henshaw, as report goes, was rejected by a vote of 40 nays, to 8 yeas. It is a great pity that the reasons given in the Senate for his rejection, cannot be made public.]

TUESDAY, January 16.

Mr. *McDuffie* gave notice that he should to-morrow call up the subject of his bill to re-establish the compromise act, on which the finance committee have reported against the power of the Senate to originate it, being a revenue bill.

Mr. *Breese's* resolution, instructing the committee of ways and means to report a bill amendatory of the bill to repeal the sub-treasury, and punish public defaulters, was adopted.

WEDNESDAY, January 17.

Mr. *Movehead*, of Kentucky, presented a petition from Cincinnati, for reduction of postage. In some conversation, Mr. *Merrick*, chairman of the post-office committee, said that the great abuse of the *franking* privilege was committed by the fifteen thousand deputy postmasters. He said the committee would have a post-office bill ready in a day or two.

The nomination of Isaac Hill to the head of the bureau of provisions and clothing, in the navy department, was rejected, and the Senate adjourned.

THURSDAY, January 18.

Mr. *McDuffie's* bill for restoring the compromise act, and the adverse report thereon, coming up, a debate took place on the question whether this, being a revenue bill, could originate in the Senate—Messrs. *Evans* and *Huntington* supporting the negative, and Mr. *Woodbury* the affirmative.

FRIDAY, January 19.

Mr. *McDuffie* addressed the Senate in a long speech, approving Mr. Clay's course in the compromise act, and passed an eulogy on his conduct on that occasion, but condemning his views on the tariff of 1842. He thought manufactures did not need this tariff; and if they did, it was injurious, &c. Mr. *Evans* followed him in a few remarks, saying that the discussion of the topic at present would have a disastrous effect on the country; when a motion was made to adjourn till Monday, and passed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, January 15.

In answer to an inquiry of Mr. *King*, of New-York, whether a report on the subject of postage might soon be expected from the post-office committee, Mr. Hopkins, of Virginia, said the committee had the subject under consideration, and had agreed to nothing; but, as far as he could judge, they were unanimous in favor of a thorough and effectual reform in this matter.

Mr. *Thomasson*, of Kentucky, who adverted to the losses of life, and particularly the recent one of from forty to one hundred citizens, from ten different States, and adverted, with warmth, to the necessity of action on that subject, offered a resolution instructing the committee of ways and means to inquire into the necessary cost of keeping in operation all the boats employed in removing obstructions in the Mississippi and its tributaries, and to report an appropriation for that purpose. Adopted.

Mr. *Black*, of Georgia, gave notice of an amendment to the bill to organize a territorial government for Oregon, for the provisional *annexation of Texas to the Union*; and

Mr. *Cave Johnson* introduced a bill to repeal the duties on salt, and the allowances made in consequence thereof.

TUESDAY, January 16.

By Mr. *McKay*, from the committee of ways and means, further appropriation bills for the present fiscal year, viz: for the payment of revolutionary and other pensions; for fortifications, and for the naval service; all which were referred to the committee of the whole on the Union, and ordered printed.

Mr. *R. J. Ingersoll* presented a petition, numerously signed by citizens of Philadelphia, (and brought on by a committee thereof,) for the reduction of postage. Mr. I. remarked that it was a subject on which the legislation of the country was clearly behind the age, and behind the public sentiment.

[Has it never occurred to Mr. Ingersoll, that "we are behind the age" in another much more important particular? We have reason to fear that he does not yet realize it.]

Mr. *Cave Johnson*, of Tennessee, moved to reconsider the vote adopting Mr. Thomasson's resolution respecting the employment of the snag-boats on the Mississippi and its tributaries.

Mr. *Bowlin*, of Missouri, improving the opportunity afforded by the recent steamboat disaster near St. Louis, appealed with much warmth to the House to grant appropriations to prevent these continually-recurring disasters. He was a *strict constructionist*, but contended that the Mississippi being a great national highway, and the Missouri, even, although running through the territory of Missouri, did not come within the scope of the constitutional objections. He referred to a rumored determination of the committee of ways and means to omit these western appropriations in the appropriation bill.

Messrs. *J. R. Ingersoll*, and *Seymour*, of New-York, (from that committee,) said they knew of no such determination.

Mr. *Weller* (also on that committee) said the committee, at one of its meetings, had come to such a conclusion.

Mr. *Stewart*, of Pennsylvania, made an admirable speech, replying, with much power, to Mr. Bowlin, and other gentlemen, and exhibiting the absurdity and inconsistency of Western democrats in denying the power of the general government over internal improvements, in all cases *except* the Mississippi, or some river in which *they* are particularly interested. That party denied the power of internal improvements, and were bound to deny it, or to abandon the standard of their presidential candidate, who denied it, peremptorily. (In proof of this, Mr. S. quoted from Mr. Van Buren.) Either it was a constitutional power, or it was not; if it was, it could not be restricted to one river, but must apply to all.

He referred to the question that had been asked, whence the money for these improvements was to be derived; and replied, from the present tariff, which admirably combined the objects of protection of revenue, and which in 1843 had yielded, as was shown by statistics, $4,000,000 more than the tariff of 1841, which was (what gentlemen were so vehemently in favor of) a revenue-tariff. He would also find the money (for although not a western man, he was in favor of appropriations for this object, as well as for others deemed necessary by Congress) by retrenching from the estimates of the Secretary of the Navy, for the army, the navy, and fortifications, six or seven millions; and referred to the fact, that during Van Buren's administration, the average expenditures of government had been over $30,432,000, while for the last year, they had been less than $22,000,000.

During these remarks, and the preceding on the tariff, which were little relished by the democrats, but which were listened to with much interest by all portions of the House, he was several times called to order by Mr. *Cave Johnson*, and others—Mr. J. insisting on his stopping, and taking his seat. Mr. S. was finally allowed to continue his remarks in order.

Mr. *J. R. Ingersoll*, with his usual ability and eloquence, advocated the cause of internal improvements, confined not to one particular section of the country, but extending, in a proper degree, to all the portions of the country, and sustained by a judicious revenue and protective tariff, &c.

Mr. *Holmes*, of South Carolina, talked of the importance of the improvement of the Mississippi—urged his western friends to unite with him in *breaking down the present oppressive restriction tariff.*

WEDNESDAY, January 17.

The debate on the subject of improvements in western navigation, was continued by Mr. *Weller*, who denounced Mr. *Stewart's* speech of yesterday as a stump speech, its delivery an outrage upon the feelings of the House, and its statements with reference to Mr. Van Buren's opinions in regard to the want of power in Congress over internal improvements, false; and promised, at some future time, to reply to it.

Mr. *Stewart*, in an explanation which he was reluctantly allowed to make, avowed himself ready to prove, from Mr. Van Buren's own letters, all he had stated; that he denied, utterly, the constitutional power of the general government to make internal improvements.

On explanation from the committee of ways and means, it appeared that they proposed to appropriate nothing for internal improvements.

Mr. *Vinton*, of Ohio, held that Congress had the power to do any and everything in aid of internal commerce, that it has in aid of foreign commerce—the language of the Constitution conveying these powers, being precisely the same, &c.

Mr. *Barnard* advocated the necessary appropriations, not for the Mississippi alone, (which only with its tributaries, according to the ideas of some western gentlemen, was included within the Constitution,) but for all the internal navigation of the country.

Mr. *Thomasson's* resolution was at length reconsidered, 95 to 77, and another adopted in lieu of it, directing the committee to inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation for working the snag-boats.

THURSDAY, January 18.

Mr. *Brown*, of Pennsylvania, offered a resolution granting the use of the Hall for a colonization meeting, this evening.

Mr. *Black*, of Georgia, objected, furiously, saying that they were as bad as abolitionists. After a delay for want of a quorum, the rules were suspended—yeas 129, nays 47; and the resolution was received and adopted.

[Mr. Black slandered the abolitionists. We should be ashamed to be no worse than the colonizationists!]

The report of the select committee on the rules of the House, came up. Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, concluded his speech in favor of the 21st rule, and intended principally to influence northern *democrats*, who have hitherto gone with the South for the rule. He argued that if they *received* petitions, the abolitionists would not be satisfied with that, but will insist upon action thereon, [To be sure we shall.] and that, therefore, they might as well shut down the gate, at once; and that merely *receiving* would not relieve them [the northern democrats] from the false issue got up on the right of petitoin.

Mr. *Hudson*, with his usual plainness and cogency of reasoning, opposed the 21st rule, contending in reply to Mr. Rhett and others, that it was a violation of the constitutional right of petition. The gentleman in a pamphlet to the people, had complained that the freedom of speech had been annihilated by the hour rule, while he maintained that the right of petition (which was guaranteed by the same clause and in the same terms of the Constitution) was fulfilled by a brief statement of the contents, and then the refusal to receive the petition! The right of petition involved the reception, reference, consideration, and action, and was not satisfied (as held by Mr. Beardsley) by mere reception, and then laying on the table.

Mr. *Beardsley* found it necessary again to explain his position. He held not that the mere reception and laying on the table, was all that was required by the right of petition; the petitions should be considered; if the House had fully made up their minds, they might lay them on the table; and it was as truly a consideration of them, as if they occupied months in discussion.

Mr. *Hudson* claimed for these petitions the same course of treatment as for others. He contended for "exclusive legislation"—for all legislative powers—for the full and unqualified power of Congress over slavery in the District. He referred to the acts of almost all the State legislatures, and to some of their constitutions—certain of the latter, (i. e. that of Mississippi,) containing a provisions against the abolition of slavery by its legislatures, so acknowledging directly, slavery to be a legitimate subject for legislation; to the amendment to the Constitution proposed by Virginia a few years ago, to restrain Congress from abolishing slavery here, except by the consent of Maryland and Virginia; to the debates in the Virginia convention which adopted the Constitution, it being opposed on this very ground, by Patrick Henry, and others, and urged on the same ground by Madison, there and in the Federalist; to the abolition of the slave trade by Congress in 1808; to the concordant opinions of all American statesmen, &c. &c. to show that slavery was a legitimate subject of legislation; and this being proved it followed that Congress had power to abolish it or not, as they chose in the District and in the territories. He pretended not that they had anything to do with it in the States. He referred to the deeds of cession, in which, notwithstanding the oft-repeated contrary declaration, there were no limitations on the subject of slavery; and replied to the question whether Virginia and Maryland would have made the cession, had they supposed slavery would have been abolished, saying that they made the cession with their eyes open, that with limitations in the deeds, the district could not have been constitutionally received; that they were moving towards its abolition in their own boundaries, and probably anticipated it here, &c. &c. Before he concluded, the morning hour expired, and the subject went over.

FRIDAY, January 18.

The "rules" then came up, and Mr. *Hudson* concluded his remarks of the day before. He contended that this discussion, instead of being a violation of the Constitution, was contemplated by the framers of it. He was followed by Mr. *Saunders*, in a lengthy speech, who endeavored to prove that the 21st rule was both right and expedient—when the morning hour having expired, the discussion was cut short.

The subject of *internal improvements* coming up, Mr. *Weller* replied to Mr. Stewart's speech, charged him with *lying*, and proceeded to numerate lies No. 1, 2, &c. as far as No. 8.

Mr. *Stewart* requested the floor to explain, but Mr. *Weller* replied that he must wear the brand, &c. There was great excitement.

Mr *Brinkerhoff*, of Ohio, began to speak, and fainted.

SATURDAY, January 19.

The subject of internal improvements was again discussed on the motion to refer the President's message.

Mr. *Beardsley*, of New-York, replied briefly to Mr. Holmes, (who denied the power of Congress over the Western waters by the Constitution, but contended that they possessed it from the ordinance of 1787,) and expressed his surprise that the gentleman at this length of time from the adoption of the Constitution, should go behind that to an act of the Congress of the confederation, for authority for one of the most important powers of the general government. He contended that the Constitution gave Congress all the power over the subject it possessed, and agreed with Mr. Vinton, that that clause giving it power to regulate commerce, did convey this power of improvement of all national, as distinguished from local, works. He was willing to vote according to the means of government appropriations for the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Hudson, the Connecticut, the Delaware, the lake, and the Atlantic coasts, according to their respective claims, &c.

Mr. *Stewart* attempted to get the floor to reply to Mr. *Weller*, but did not succeed. The residue of the message was deferred.

Mr. Stewart was finally permitted to be heard. He said that the member from Ohio had loaded him with billingsgate, but had not refuted one of his arguments.

Mr. *Holmes*, in ridicule of the affair, gravely brought forward a resolution instructing the judiciary committee to inquire into the expediency of repealing the law for the suppression of dueling! which occasioned a burst of laughter. It was objected to, and not received.

[A sorry jest for a legislator! If it meant anything, it was to insinuate that *Weller* and *Stewart*, or one of them, is a coward; or it was to hint to them that they ought to fight!]

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

A man named JOHN L. BROWN, is now under sentence of death, in South Carolina, for the *crime* of assisting a fellow-being to escape from bondage. The 26th of April is the day of execution. This is Southern justice:—*ergo*, the signers of the Declaration of Independence should all have died on the scaffold, for leading three millions of people from vassalage!

The cost of transporting a barrel of flour from New York to Boston, is twelve and a half cents, while the postage on a single letter from the same place, is eighteen and three-fourths cents.

DEATH-BED CONFESSION.—We learn verbally, says the Rahway (N. J.) Republican, that a person living in Middlebush, Somerset county, one day last week made a confession, acknowledging that himself and Peter Robinson, (the murderer of Suydam at New Brunswick,) were the persons who murdered Robert F. Randolph, in Dark Lane, near Metuchen, about twelve years since. The person referred to, it is said, made the confession on his death-bed, and has since died.

The United States Senate have confirmed the appointment of Mr. Upshur as secretary of State, and of Mr. Nelson, as attorney general of the United States.

From Franconia—thirty below!—We learn from the Salem Gazette, that in franconia, New Hampshire, on Tuesday last, the spirit themometer was down to 26, and mercury to 30 degrees below zero!

Resources of Massachusetts.—From Governor Briggs's late address to the legislature, we gather the following items:

Manufacturing capital, $42,000,000; annual value of manufactures, $800,000,000; agricultural produce, $15,000,000; invested in the fisheries, $12,000,000; tons of shipping, 445,901; 4 colleges, with 769 students; 251 acadamies and high shools, with 16,746 students; 3,362 common schools, with 160,258 pupils; annual expenditure for education, $1,000,000; products of other States annually purchased by Massachusetts, $40,000,000.

Moses W. Ham, of Farmington, New Hampshire, was frozen to death on the highway, in consequence of partial intoxication. He was lying in the road, his horse and sleigh standing near.

Governor Francis Thomas has been arrested, and held to bail in the sum of $1500, conditioned that he shall keep the peace. He had threatened Dr. Tyler, of Frederick, with personal violence, on account of some matter connected with the governor's quarrel with his lady. Last spring, Governor McDowell, of Virginia, gave Governor Thomas a beating, for attempting to take passage in a stage with Governor McD. and his daughter, Governor T.'s wife.

Charge of Bigamy.—At Philadelphia, J. G. Moore was charged with bigamy. It appeared, in evidence, that he was married in Chester, two years ago, where the wife is now living; and again in this city, about a month ago. Both wives were present, and Moore took occasion to introduce each to the other, in the alderman's office, as Mrs. Moore the first, and Mrs. Moore the second. When arrested, he drew a sword from a cane, and made an attack upon officer Roberts, the weapon glancing slightly against the officer's arm. Moore was committed for a further hearing.

Caution.—Two persons, one in New Orleans, and one in Philadelphia, have lately fallen through hatchways of stores, and been impaled upon the hooks of the pullies. One died—after remaining suspended in that awful situation, without help, for some time—soon after he was taken down. The other survives, in a very critical situation.

Capital Punishment.—A bill is before the legislature of Pennsylvania, substituting imprisonment for life, instead of death.

The Vermont legislature, at its late session, enlarged the time of postponing the execution of capital sentences, to fifteen months.

Married,

At New Hartford, Oneida county, New-York, on the 11th instant, in the order of the Society of Friends, A. FRANCIS COLLINS, of North Stonington, Ct. to ELECTA JANE, daughter of Job S. Collins, of Utica.

Died.

On the 15th of September, 1843, of consumption, NATHAN WHITMORE, aged 24 years.

[COMMUNICATED.]

On the 28th ultimo, in her 23d year, LYDIA C. wife of Thomas Gawthrop, of New London township, Chester county, Pa. Her illness, though not of the severest kind, was tedious and protracted; yet was borne with that unshaken fortitude, and patient resignation, which truly characterize a Christian spirit. She has left with her bereaved husband, an infant babe—a pledge of her fidelity and love, a happy emblem of her innocence and her virtue—and a widely-extended circle of relations and friends, to mourn her early departure. But in this dispensation they have the deep and abiding consolation, that she has ever given the strongest evidence of her love to God, by that love which she has always borne to her kind.

In Oxford, on the 3d instant, after a short illness of three weeks, Mr. ISAAC PENDLETON, aged 62 years.

Mr. Pendleton was born in the town of Westerly, R. I. He was extensively known in this section as a worthy and valuable citizen. In the early part of his life, his attention was called to the subject of religion; at which time, as he has since related, a decided change occurred in his views and feelings—a change which proved to be great as well as lasting; so great as to encourage him and his friends to believe that it was no less than that described by the Saviour.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but has passed from death unto life."

For many years he has been connected with the Society of Friends. He was a Friend, not only by profession, but a friend in principle and *deed;* not only a friend and a brother in his own denomination, but a friend to the family of man. He was no respector of *persons*, but of character. The meetings of his society being quite a distance from his residence, he could only visit them occasionally. Being liberal in his feelings towards other Christian denominations, he was accustomed to attend public worship at the Baptist church, with his family; also the social meetings, held in his neighborhood, he frequently attended, and often took an active part in them much to his own and his Christian neighbor's satisfaction. He saw and lamented the inconsistency of our country; and especially of the Christian community, in suffering slavery to exist in our land. He could have no fellowship for this wicked system, nor for its advocates; but exerted his influence and gave liberally of his funds to diffuse light on this great and painful subject; and had he lived a few years longer, no doubt he would have done much more than he has done for the poor slave; for the subject occupied his thoughts even amidst the sufferings of his dying hour. Though his health had been feeble for some length of time, he was confined to his house only about three weeks. The writer conversed with him before his disease was considered alarming. He then spoke of death with perfect composure, and of the support of the gospel with gratitude and joy. The disease of which he died, was pronounced by his physicians to be a derangement of the liver. During his sickness, he endured excruciating pain, but not an expression of murmur escaped his lips. He more than once remarked that, if it was the Lord's will, he would like to live a few years longer, for the benefit of the younger part of his family, for whom he manifested an anxious desire; but would immediately add—"The will of the Lord be done." During some of his last hours, he observed that he had not thought that a dying bed could be made so easy and pleasant. During the night, some twelve hours before he died, he desired his afflicted family to be called into his room, when, with perfect composure and paternal affection, he counselled with each of them, and gave each his blessing and his most affectionate, faithful, and solemn charge, commending them to the care and blessing of God. He gave directions concerning his funeral, and for a little time before his spirit took its flight, he became more and more easy until he fell asleep in Jesus.

In the death of Mr. Pendleton, his bereaved widow has lost a most tender and affectionate husband, his children, a prudent and affectionate father, the poor a wise councellor, and a cheerful benefactor, the slave, a firm and consistent friend and advocate, his society a pious and valuable member, and the community a worthy citizen.

"The righteous hath hope in his death." "And I heard a voice from Heaven, saying unto me, write blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors and their works do follow them."

The funeral services were attended at the late residence of Mr. Pendleton on Lord's day, agreeable to the usages of the Friends, at which an unusually large congregation assembled.

ABOLITIONISTS, PAY YOUR DEBTS!

The Executive Committee of the American Society have adopted the ONE DOLLAR PLAN, for the special purpose of paying the debt, for which partial provision only was made at the late annual meeting.

The question is now to be answered—*Does the American Anti-Slavery Society number twenty-five hundred members, who are able to pay One Dollar each, for the payment of its debt?* If so, we shall soon be an honest society. If not, we shall soon cease to be a society at all. Our operations cannot be continued, if we cannot go upon the cash system.

Friends of the Society are requested to act as agents in their respective localities, and to collect without delay as much as they can, and remit to the Treasurer.

PAYMENT RECEIVED.

Amount previously acknowledged,	$83
384 Eliza Agnew, Chester co. Pa.	1
385 Isaac S. Flint, " "	1
386 Mary Cooke, " "	1
387 Levi Scarlett, " "	1
388 John Burr, Philadelphia,	1

TREASURER'S RECEIPTS

For the week ending 1st mo. (Jan.) 20th, 1844.

Received for the Standard—The following persons have each paid $2: Wright & Shaw, Cortsville, Ohio; Leprelete Wilmarth, Attleborough, Mass.; Hannah Whiting, Darien, Ct.; Jonathan Phillips, Boston; William Dall, do.; J. Thorn, Clifton, Ohio; Doctor John McCall, Utica, N. Y.; John Atkinson, Philadelphia; John Lake, Woodstock, Vt.—Total $18.

Sarah Taggart, Mill Creek, Ohio, $1; A. Tracy, Oberlin, Ohio, $1; Joseph A. Dugdale, Cortsville, Ohio, $3; Oliver Hampton and Elijah Quimby, Hickory Grove, Michigan, $5; C. Fountain, Honey Falls, Monroe county, N. Y. $1; ———, Schuyler's Lake, Otsego co. N. Y. per Abby Kelley, $1 50; N. C. Gove, Lincoln, Mass. $1; Alanson Sherman, Palmyra, N. Y. $5; Philadelphia A. S. Society, $5.—Total, $22 50.

Wm. C. Rogers, Utica, for almanacs, $16.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, *Treasurer.*

NOTICES.

OLD WINDHAM COUNTY AGAIN.

The Windham County Anti-Slavery Society will again call the attention of the public to the subject of human chattelship, as it exists in our country, on Tuesday, February 6th, in Danielsonville, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Abolitionists, will you be faithful to your high trust; the cause of the oppressed is in your hands, and let it not be said that you are willing to sacrifice the interests of the down-trodden, for the paltry interests of politics and ungodly sectarianism. The cause, if ever, *now* demands your utmost energies.

JAMES B. WHITCOMB, Sec'y.
Brooklyn, January 17th 1844.

WESTERN NEW-YORK ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

We invite the attention of the public to the second fair of the Western New-York Anti-Slavery Sewing Society, to be held 22d of 2d month, (February) next, the avails of which are designed for the dissemination of truth on the subject of slavery, and to enlighten public opinion as far as in us lies, to its great evils and direful consequences.

Circumstances fully justifying, the meeting was adjourned to the *third day*, to-morrow morning, 9 o'clock.

For the welfare of the oppressor as well as the oppressed, we deem it our imperative duty to call upon the friends of humanity to aid us in our labors for the overthrow of this high-handed sin, and knowing the present only is ours, we adopt the language of Blair: "Let him who wishes to see others happy, make haste to give while his gift can be enjoyed, reflecting that the day rolls on, and the night cometh, when no man can work;" and let us bear in mind the words of the blessed Jesus "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." It is our earnest desire there may not be any found yielding to discouragements, with the impression that the little they can do will avail nothing, but remember "He that is faithful in the little shall be made ruler over much."

Anything from the farmer, merchant, or mechanic, will be gratefully received; and we ask our friends in the country, or different towns in Western New-York, far and near, to prepare articles and attend with us as their company to cheer us in our labors at the Fair will be inspiriting and salutary to our best feelings.

Any donation, whether it be butter, cheese, potatoes, nuts, or any kind of fruit, or whatever it may please our friends to offer, either previous, or at the time of the Fair, may be forwarded to the president, Abigail Rush, Buffalo street, opposite the burrying ground, corner of Litchfield street, or to Post and Wil[illegible]s, No. 4 Exchange street, Rochester.

Committee—Abigail Bush, Amy Post, Ann Pound, Elizabeth G. Curtiss, Mary H. Hallowell, Mary B. Fish, Catharine A. Fish, Charlotte Sears, Sarah A. Burtis, Sarah L. Hallowell, Sarah D. Fish.

P. S. Some stocking yarn, forthwith from any of our friends would be very acceptable.

O'CONNELL'S ADDRESS.

For sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, Philadelphia, *O'Connell's letter to the Cincinnati Repealers; complete* in pamphlet form. Price two cents per single copy, twenty cents per dozen. This is O'Connell's last and best address on the subject of American slavery, and one of the best pamphlets for anti-slavery circulation ever published. Every abolitionist ought to supply himself with a quantity for distribution.

PHILADELPHIA FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

The members of this society are requested to call at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 31 North Fifth street, and obtain memorials to Congress and to the State Legislature for circulation. Let the work of soliciting subscribers be promptly commenced.

NEW-YORK WHOLESALE PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED WEEKLY FOR THE STANDARD.

ASHES.	
Pot, first sort	4.62½ a
Pearl	5.12½ a
CANDLES.	
Mould, tallow lb.	9 a 11½
Dipped do.	— a —
Sperm	31 a 33
COAL.	
Liverpool,chaldron,	8.00 a 8.25
Newcastle	6.50 a 7.50
Scotch	7.00 a 8.00
Sidney Pictou	5.75 a 6.00
Anthracite, 2,000lbs.	5.00 a 5.50
COFFEE.	
Java	10 a 11
Sumatra	7¼ a 7½
Porto Rico	7¾ a 8¼
Laguayra	7½ a 7¾
Cuba	6¾ a 7½
Brazil	6¾ a 7
St. Domingo	5½ a 5¾
COTTON.	
New Orleans	8 a 12½
Alabama	8 a 12½
Florida	7½ a 10½
Upland	8 a 10½
Upland, fair	9¾ a 10
Upland, good and fine	10¼ a 10½
DOMESTICS.	
Shirtings, brown 3-4	4½ a 6
do. do. 7-8	8 a 7
do. bleached	5 a 8
do. S. I. do.	7 a 11
Sheetings, brown 4-4	7 a 9
do. do. 5-4	10 a 12½
do. bleached 4-4	7 a 12
do. do. 5-4	12 a 15
Calicoes, blue	7 a 12
do. fancy	6 a 8
Plaids	9 a 11
Stripes, fast colors	8 a 10
Satinetts	35 a 70
Checks 4-4	8 a 12
Cotton yarn, 5 a 13	11 a 14
do. 14 a 16	— a 15
do. 20 a 23	— a —
DRUGS & DYES.	
Alum, lb.	3 a
Cochineal	.95 a 1.05
Copperas	1½ a 1¾
Gum shellac	15 a 45
do. copal washed	35 a 42
do. Arabic	22 a 38
Madder	18 a 17
Oil of Vitriol	2.50 a 2.75
castor, gall.	80 a 85
Tartaric acid, lb.	38 a 40
Verdigris	23 a 25
Vitriol, blue	8 a —
DYEWOODS.	
Brazilletto, ton	25.00 a 27.50
Camwood	50.00 a 60.00
Fustic, Cuba	23.00 a 26.00
do. Tampico	16.00 a 18.00
Logwood, Cpy.	27.00 a 28.00
FEATHERS.	
Live, foreign lb.	13 a 24
do. American	26 a 28
FISH.	
Dry cod, cwt.	2.50 a 2.62½
Dry scale	1.25 a 1.50
Pickled, bbl.	4.00 a 4.25
do. salmon, tce	16.00 a 17.00
Smoked do. lb.	.9 a .10
Mackeral, 1, bbl.	10.56 a 10.75
do. No. 2	8.56 a 8.75
do. No. 3	5.50 a 7.00
Shad, Ct. hf. bbl.	5.50 a 6.50
Bucksp't. bbl.	6.00 a 7.00
Mass. do.	12.50 a 13.00
Herring, pickled	3.00 a 3.50
do. scale box,	40 a .42½
do. No. 1	30 a .
do. No. 2	20 a .
FLAX.	
Russia, lb.	8 a 11
American	8 a 8½
FLOUR & MEAL.	
Genesee	4.75 a 4.81¼
Troy	4.62 a .
Ohio, via canal	4.56 a 4.75
Michigan	4.75 a .
Philadelphia	4.75 a .
Baltimore	. a .
Richmond c. mills	4.62½ a 4.75
do. country	4.75 a 4.87½
Brandywine	4.87½ a 5.00
Georgetown	4.87½ a 5.00
Alexandria	4.50 a .
Fredericksburg	. a .
Petersburg	. a 5.00
Rye flour	3.37½ a 3.50
Indian meal	2.50½ a 2.62½
do. per hhd.	12.00 a 12.25
GRAIN.	
Wheat, Ohio bush.	1.00 a 1.04
do. Genesee	94 a .96
do. Southern new	90 a 1.00
Rye northern	63 a .64
Corn north'n & Jersey	43 a .58
Southern	44 a .50
Barley, N.R.	54 a .
Oats, northern	36 a .37
do. southern	32 a .34
do. New-Jersey	
Beans, tce.	6.12 a 7.62½
Peas do.	6.12 a 7.25
HEMP.	
Russia, ton	180 a 185
Manilla	. a 135
American, dew rot	100.00 a 110.00
do. water rot	120.00 a 180.00
HIDES.	
B. A. & Rio Grande, lb.	12 a 13
California	4 a 11
Oronoco	a 11½
Mexican	10 a 11½
S. American horse, piece	a
Calcutta, dry	60 a .85
HOPS.	
First sort 1843, lb.	8 a 9
HORNS.	
Ox, hundred	5.00 a 7.50
Cow	1.00 a 1.55

IRON.	
Pig,Eng. & Sc. ton	32.00 a 34.00
do. American	25.00 a 28.50
Bar do. rolled	a 70.00
do. Russia PSI	a 100.00
do. do. new do.	75.00 a .
do. Swedes	70.50 a 80.00
do. Eng. com.	. a 57.50
do. do. refined	. a 70.00
Sheet E. & Am. lb.	5½ a 5¾
Hoop do. do. cwt.	5.00 a 5.50
LEAD.	
Pig, 100 lbs.	3.50 a 3.56¼
Bar, lb.	4 a 4½
Sheet	4½ a
LEATHER.	
Oak lb. (sole,)	19 a 24
Hemlock, light	16½ a 17
do. middle	16 a 17
do. heavy	14½ a 15½
do. damaged	13½ a 14
LUMBER.	
Boards, N. R. M. ft.	30.00 a 35.00
do. east pine	. a 10.00
do. Albany, piece	7 a .17
Plank Ga. pine, M. ft.	20.00 a 25.00
Scantling pine	14.00 a 15.00
do. oak	30.00 a 35.00
Timber oak, cu. ft.	.25 a .37
do. Ga. yel. pine	.35 a .40
Shingles, cy. M.	11.00 a 14.00
Staves w. o. pipe M.	46.00 a 50.00
do. do. hhd.	34.00 a 35.00
do. do. bbl.	27.00 a 28.00
do. r. oak hhd.	26.00 a .
Heading, w. o.	40.00 a 45.00
Hoops	25.00 a 30.00
MOLASSES.	
New-Orleans, gall.	30 a 31
Porto Rico	25 a 25
St. Croix	26 a 27
Trinidad, Cuba	22 a 28
Martinique & Guadaloupe	a
Havana & Matanzas	27 a 28
Neuvitas	25 a 26
NAILS.	
Cut, 4d a 40d	4 a 4½
(3d 1 cent and 2d 2 cents more.)	
Wrought, 6d a 20d	10 a 12½
Horseshoe, No. 7 a 9	18 a 20
NAVAL STORES.	
Tar, bbl.	1.25 a 1.50
Pitch	1.12½ a 1.25
Rosin	.65 a .93
Turp. Wil'ton soft	2.50 a 2.62½
do. N. C. soft	2.26 a 2.62½
Spirits turp'tine gal.	32 a 34
OILS.	
Olive, gall.	87 a 90
Linseed, American	75 a 76
Whale	40 a 43
Sperm, fall	75 a 77
do. winter	85 a 87
Lard oil	a 65
PROVISIONS.	
Beef mess bbl.	6.00 a 6.50
do. prime	4.00 a 4.50½
Butter, prime	15 a 16
do. ord. to good	8 a 12
do. common	6 a
Hog's lard	5½ a 6¾
Pork, mess bbl.	9.25 a 10.25
do. prime	7.75 a 8.25
do. cargo	a
Cheese, Am. lb.	4½ a 5½
Hams smoked	4 a 9
RICE.	
100 lbs.	2.50 a 3.00
SALT.	
Turkish Isl. bushel	26 a 27
Bonaire	31 a 32
Curacoa	26 a 26
Ivica	
Cadiz	22 a
St. Kitts	a
Lisbon	a
Liverpool, ground	a 25
do. do. sack	1.17 a 1.20
do. do. fine	1.37½ a 1.45
SOAP.	
New-York, brown lb.	5 a 7
Castile	11 a 11½
STEEL.	
German lb.	10½ a 13
English, hoop L.	13 a 13½
Trieste, in boxes	6½ a 7
American	5 a
Spring	5¾ a 6
SUGARS.	
St. Croix, lb.	7½ a 8
New-Orleans	7 a 8
Cuba, Muscovado	7 a 7¾
Porto Rico	7 a 8
Havana, white	8¾ a 9½
do. brown	7 a 7¾
Cuba white	9 a 10
do. brown	6¾ a 7¼
Brazil, white	8¼ a 8¾
do. brown	a
Manilla, brown	6½ a 6¾
Lump	
Loaf	11½ a 12½
TALLOW.	
Foreign, lb.	
American	a 7½
TEAS.	
Imperial, lb.	30 a 90
Gunpowder	30 a 90
Hyson	37½ a 90
Young Hyson	33½ a 80
Hyson skin	20 a 40
Souchong	25 a 50
Bohea	a
TIN.	
Block, South Am. lb.	a
do. East India	14 a 14½
In plates ¼ ⋈ box	8.25 a 9.00
WOOL.	
Am. Sax'y. fleece, lb.	38 a 40
do. merino	36 a 38
Pulled, superfine	32 a 38
No. 1	28 a 30
No. 2	22 a 25

Poetry.

THE PARSON AND HIS FLOCK.

In the old almanac, "Poor Richard," published by Hugh Gaine, in 1792, we find the following metrical story, illustrating the impossibility of pleasing everybody, unless all can be of one mind—affording, of course, a useful lesson to the editors of newspapers, who are expected by so many to perform that impossible thing. Every reader of every newspaper expects that every article, published in every successive number, shall exactly square with his own peculiar feelings, principles, and opinions, upon every possible subject. But to the story, which the almanac declares to have been true.

The people of a certain place
Refused a pastor to embrace,
Unless that he would undertake
The weather to their minds to make.

The thing was hard, you will confess,
To be accomplished with success;
And therefore most the charge declined,
By reason of the task enjoined.

At length, one wiser than the rest,
A candidate himself professed;
And he did frankly take in hand
To satisfy all their demand.

Now, full of hopes, they all expect
To see his promise take effect;
But, to their disappointment sore,
The weather proved—just as before.

Of this some loudly did complain,
(Now that they thought their hopes in vain,)
And now their pastor they accused,
That he had grossly them abused.

Now some in secret discontent,
Did their unhappy case lament;
Some to their pastor straight repaired,
And their complaint to him declared.

He first did gravely reprimand
Their bold, impertinent demand;
Told them they need not be afraid,
For he'd make good what he had said.

On this they, all submission, craved
His pardon, and themselves behaved
With all respect and reverence,
And still in him put confidence.

"My friends," quoth he, "to testify
My readiness to gratify
Your inclination, and to show
My own veracity also
I only want an opportunity
Before the whole of this community,
My solemn promise to fulfill,
And give such weather as you will.
Yet, friends, you all must see, that first,
To me, and all, 'tis only just,
That I your sentiments consult,
And of the same know the result;—
Assemble, then, and let me know,
How you would have the wind to blow."

"You, friend, (I know not yet your names,")—
Then stood up one—"My name is James,"—
"Well, James, your judgment tell me plain,
What weather choose you?" "I'm for rain."

"You, honest man, what is your name?
Is it not John?" "The very same."
"Then, John, what say you?" "I'm for drought."
"And you the next, your mind speak out;
Are you for rain; or for dry weather?"
"Why, ra-ly, sir, I am for neither."
"For neither, say you! pray, what then?
You must, my friend, yourself explain."
"Temperate weather, I think best."
The next said, "Let the wind blow west."
"Nay, from the east," another says—
"I'd have it blow for certain days."

Thus one by one, each worthy brother's
Wishes differed from all others,
Until the wearied parson rose,
His own opinions to disclose:

"My friends," said he, "this will not do;
Who can give rain and dryness, too?
At present you cannot agree;—
We, therefore, must dismiss, I see.

'Gainst your next meeting make your choice;
Speak your opinion with one voice;
Be of one mind: and then I shall
Give weather that will please you all."

Thus, kind readers, be of one mind in everything, and we will pledge ourselves to make a newspaper that will please everybody.

◆

SPEAK NOT TO HIM A BITTER WORD.

Would'st thou a wanderer reclaim,
A wild and restless spirit tame:
Check the warm flow of youthful blood,
And lead a lost one back to God?
Pause if thy spirit's wrath be stirred—
Speak not to him a bitter word—
Speak not—that bitter word may be
The stamp that seals his destiny.

If widely he hath gone astray,
And dark excess hath marked his way,
'Tis pitiful—but yet beware,
Reform must come with kindly care;
Forbid thy parting lips to move,
Save in the gentle tones of love;
Though sadly his young heart hath erred
Speak not to him a bitter word.

The lowering frown he will not bear,
The venomed chidings will not hear,
The ardent spirit will not brook
The stinging tooth of sharp rebuke;
Thou would'st not goad the restless steed,
To calm his fire or check his speed;
Then let no angry tones be heard—
Speak not to him an angry word.

Go kindly to him—make him feel
Your heart yearns deeply for his weal;
Tell him the dangers thick that lay
Around his "widely devious way!"
So shall thou win him—call him back
From pleasure's smooth, seductive track,
And warning thou hast mildly given,
May guide the wanderer up to heaven.

◆

RICH AND POOR.

BY L. E. LANDON.

Few, save the poor, feel for the poor;
The rich know not how hard
It is to be of needful food,
And needful rest debarred.

Their paths are paths of plenteousness,
They sleep on silk and down;
And never think how heavily
The weary head lies down.

They know not of the scanty meal,
With small, pale faces round;
No fire upon the cold, damp hearth,
When snow is on the ground.

They never by the window lean,
And see the gay pass by;
Then take their weary task again,
But with a sadder eye.

Miscellany.

From the New-York Tribune.

HYDROPATHY, OR WATER CURE.

BY CAPTAIN CLARIDGE.

(*Continued.*)

Now, here was a fever checked at once by this simple process. For scarlatina, measles, and small-pox, it was equally effectual. If this system were adopted, he was satisfied that they would not lose one child in a thousand, that now died from these and other diseases. By this adoption, even vaccination would become unnecessary, as the moment the small-pox appeared, the wet sheet would be put on as was necessary, the virus extracted, and the child cured; and all the time, after each application, the child might be sent to play. There was no lying in bed, under the cold water cure. Air, exercise, and water, were the whole paraphernalia of Preissnitz; and at his establishment, no one lay a-bed while under the treatment. Here the captain related the cure of his daughter of scarlatina, as described in the former lecture, and went on to enforce the utility of the wet sheet, in almost all diseases; indeed, he did not care what the ailment was, his recommendation was to try the wet sheet. He next referred to the douche, or fall of water, which was employed when it was necessary to create commotion in the system; and to the sitz, or hip bath, which was a very valuable part of the treatment. This was used by simply sitting down in a washing-tub, with the feet out, and a wet cloth round the head. It was exceedingly useful in all cases of heat or fever about the head, and upper parts of the body. Bathing the feet in cold water—never in warm—was also an excellent remedial agent; and he recommended putting a wet cloth, with a dry one over, round any part of the body affected by disease. This might be done in bed, with the most perfect security. In the case of a cold, with pain in the chest, for example, place a wet cloth over the chest and throat, cover it with a dry one, and go to bed. Children, when teething, were greatly relieved by an application of wet cloths.

He next recommended the drinking of cold water, because water was the greatest dissolvent known. Every person should take as much cold water as he could use, and avoid alcohol, and other stimulants. He must say, judging from what he saw in the streets, that he did not regard the people of Scotland as very favorable to hydropathy. (hear.) It was very different in Ireland. During the three months he was there, he never saw a man drunk, or raising his hand against his brother; nor during the whole of these three months, did he hear one oath. Whatever might be the agitation now going on there, a more quiet, unoffending people, he never saw. (hear.) He would recommend, whatever a man chose to do during the day, that he should drink at least a tumbler of water before breakfast; if ill of indigestion or dyspepsia, let him drink four or five tumblers. But it should be borne in mind that water, any more than too much food, would not digest without exercise. A man might be as ill of indigestion from bad water, as from anything else.

Another matter of great importance, was the purification of the skin. The skin was the great excretive and secretive function of the body. The pores were so fine that they could not be seen by the microscope; it was clear, therefore, that if the skin was not regularly and thoroughly cleansed, these innumerable pores would close up, and the matter which ought to be exuded from the body, arrested in its progress outward; and if it did not get egress, it would again be sent back into the system.

Captain Claridge next showed the propriety of the cold water cure, from the fact that by means of it we forever get rid of those noxious things, called drugs, but which were neither more nor less than poisons. He had himself, at one time, been a capital customer with the doctors. He consulted the most eminent medical men in every place he went to, and swallowed their poisons, in great quantities; but now he was done with them, and their prescriptions, and believed he would never feel pain for any length of time again. There was nothing that doctors could produce with drugs, which he could not produce with water; therefore, he would never be a customer to an apothecary again.

Now, this was a mode of cure that might be taken up by any of them; but he perceived that here there was only one medical man who had adopted the system. Though about fifty books had been published on the subject, and these books reviewed by the public press all over the country, he nevertheless found that there was only one medical man here who had taken it up, and that was Dr. Patterson. (cheers.) He had had a conversation with Dr. Patterson, and found that he fully understood the cold water treatment. That gentleman had been at the establishment of Vincent Preissnitz, where he witnessed the mode of cure pursued by that extraordinary genius, and he had the courage, in spite of all opposition, and in the knowledge that his doing so would cause him to be denounced as a quack, to commence an establishment at Rothsay. He had no acquaintance with Dr. Patterson; but from the conversation he had with him, he believed him to be fully acquainted with the nature of the water cure. He need scarcely tell the audience that in thus traveling the country, and holding meetings like the present, he had no present object in view—he had no other motives but those of humanity. (cheers.) The money collected now, was for the purpose of paying the expenses of the meetings; and he believed the gentlemen who had taken charge of the matter, had arranged that, if there was any surplus, it should be given to some charitable institution. (cheers) Capt. Claridge then proceeded to enumerate some extraordinary cures, performed through him while in Ireland. One or two of these we shall refer to. Dr. Russell, of the thirty-sixth regiment, lying at Limerick, took him to the hospital of the regiment, where he succeeded in curing a man of severe chronic rheumatism; but the principal cure was that of a soldier, of the tenth hussars, who was lying ill of sciatica, unable to rise from his bed, and much reduced. He was a great favorite in the regiment, and he was told that, if that man could be cured, it would certainly be regarded as very extraordinary. He accordingly went to visit him. Dr. Gore, an old physician, who accompanied them, said the cure was out of the question. He had two hundred such cases, and never cured one of them. He (Capt. Claridge) directed what should be done; the sweating process, and the other modes usually followed, were put in operation; and he would now read a letter from Dr. Russell, showing the result:

My Dear Sir—I am happy to tell you that three more of the severe cases of chronic rheumatism that I have put under the sweating process, are to-day *decidedly* better. The man of the tenth hussars, who had not been free from suffering for two or three months, with sciatica, has had no pain for three days past, and is going out of the hospital to-day. Yours, faithfully,

JOHN RUSSELL,
Surgeon 36th reg't, quartered
at Limerick, 25th June.

To Capt. Claridge.

From the Christian Reflector.

SUCCESS AND ECCENTRICITIES OF ROWLAND HILL.

Among the many results of Mr. Rowland Hill's labors at this time in London, none were more remarkable than the extraordinary conversion of several notorious infidels and persecutors. Some of these became afterwards zealous promoters of the cause they once hated and despised.

One individual, a member of an infidel club, came on a Sunday evening into Surrey chapel, merely to gratify his curiosity, or to ridicule the truths he heard, but returned home crying for mercy and pardon; and in a few days after, visited Mr. Rowland Hill, to inquire what he should do to be saved. He was a man engaged in a laborious business, but dedicated his few leisure hours to the service of God; and it is supposed that his benevolent exertions brought him to a premature, but happy termination of his life. Another man, a drunkard, swearer and cruel persecutor of his wife, who belonged to Mr. Wesley's society, received her one evening, on her return from his chapel, with such kindness of manner, that she was astonished. He said, "I have been to hear Mr. Hill;—I am a sinner; you were right, I was wrong—I hope I shall never be unkind to you again, but that we shall walk together in the same way." Instances such as these, were of frequent occurrence, in addition to the numbers of the careless and indifferent, whom his ministry aroused from their awful lethargy. The reports that were in circulation of his odd sayings in the pulpit, brought not a few into his chapel, where they heard, instead of observations to excite their mirth, an awakening appeal to sinners, that sent them as trembling and weeping penitents to a throne of grace. Most of the anecdotes told of his eccentricities in the pulpit, are incorrect, though it is certain that at times he did illustrate his meaning, by introducing into his sermon what he often acknowledged afterwards, he had better left out—"but," he would add, "the queer thought came into my head, and out it came, and I could not help it; I wish it had kept in though." It almost always happened, that whenever he had given way to his natural disposition for the ludicrous, or had been more than usually eccentric in his manner, there followed a lowness of spirits, and he then acknowledged the regret he felt, at having been led away by any levity of mind, while engaged in the solemn service of the pulpit. A gentleman of his acquaintance, once met him at Brighton, where he heard him preach a sermon, in which there was such a mixture of the humorous, that the congregation were excited by it, to a considerable degree of laughter. This was followed by such an awful address to their consciences, and a pathos so deep and melting, that there was scarcely an individual present, who did not weep. In the evening, the conversation at the house in which he was visiting, was of a very lively nature. After Mr. Hill retired, the gentleman before alluded to, thought he heard some one in the passage, and on going out, found him at the foot of the stairs. He feared he was unwell; but on inquiring the reason of his remaining there, he discovered him to be in deep agony of mind, to which he gave vent in confessions of sorrow, at having been such a trifler, and mourned over his unseasonable drollery, with the simplicity of a child. Before he went to his room, he said—"I never wish to say a single word to excite a smile, which would prevent an immediate approach to God, in all the solemnity of spiritual prayer." The scene was most affecting, and was a striking proof of his contrition when he reflected, that by giving way to the natural sprightliness of his disposition, he might have prevented his real usefulness, or have forgotten for an instant the character of a messenger of the gospel.

THE EMPRESS JOSEPHINE.

The history of the Empress Josephine had been very remarkable. She was born in the West Indies; and it had early been prophesied by an old negress, that she should lose her first husband, be extremely unfortunate, but she should afterwards be greater than a queen. (The author heard this prophecy long before Napoleon's elevation to the throne, from the late Countess of Bath, and the Countess of Ancram, who were educated in the same convent with Josephine, and had repeatedly heard her mention the circumstance, in early youth.) This prophecy, the authenticity of which is placed beyond a doubt, was fulfilled in the most singular manner. Her first husband, Alexander Beauharnois, a general of the army on the Rhine, had been guillotined during the Reign of Terror; and she herself, who was also imprisoned at the same time, was only saved from impending death by the fall of Robespierre.—So strongly was the prophecy impressed on her mind, that while lying in the dungeon of Conciergerie, expecting every hour to be summoned to the revolutionary tribunal, she mentioned it to her fellow-prisoners; and to amuse them, named some of them as ladies of the bed-chamber; a jest which she afterwards lived to realize on one of their number.

Josephine herself narrated this extraordinary passage in her life, in the following terms, in her memoirs:

"One morning, the jailor entered the chamber where I slept, with the Duchess d'Aiguillon and two other ladies, and told me he was going to take my matress, to give it to another prisoner. Why, said Madame d'Aiguillon, eagerly; will not Madame de Beauharnois obtain a better one? No, no, he replied, with a fiendish smile; she will have no need of one, for she is about to be led to the Conciergerie, and thence to the guillotine. At these words, my companions in misfortune uttered piercing shrieks. I consoled them as well as I could; and at length, worn out with their eternal lamentation, I told them that their grief was utterly unreasonable; that not only I should not die, but live to be Queen of France. Why, then, do you not name your maids of honor, said Madame d'Aiguillon, irritated at such expressions, at such a moment. Very true, said I; I did not think of that; well, my dear, I make you one of them. Upon this, the fears of one of these ladies fell apace, for they never doubted I was mad. But the truth was, I was not gifted with any extraordinary courage, but internally persuaded of the truth of the oracle.

Madame d'Aiguillon soon after became unwell, and I drew her towards the window, which I opened to admit through the bars a little fresh air. I there perceived a poor woman who knew us, and who was making a number of signs, which I first could not understand. She constantly held up her gown, (robe,) and seeing she had some object in view, I called out, 'robes,' to which she answered, yes. She then lifted up a stone, and put it in her lap, which she lifted a second time. I called out, 'pierre;' upon which she evinced the greatest joy at perceiving that her signs were understood. Joining then the stone in her robe, she eagerly imitated the motion of cutting off the neck, and immediately began to dance, and evince the most extravagant joy. This singular pantomime awakened in our minds a vague hope that possibly Robespierre might be no more.

At this moment, when we were floating between hope and fear, we heard a great noise in the corridor, and the terrible voice of our jailor, who said to his dog, giving him, at the same time, a kick, 'get, out, you cursed Robespierre.' That coarse phrase at once taught us that we had nothing to fear, and that France was saved."—*Alison's History of Europe.*

A CLEAR DEFINITION.

A Frenchman in St. Louis, has sent the following communication to the editor of the Mound City:

MONS. EDITEUR:—I spake the English language sometimes almost, not quite, vere vell, and my friens tell a me zat I soon he so proficient, zat I can open an academie for ze petit enfans—mais, but I often sometimes fall in wis words which I no comprehend—par example. My frien tell me sometime ago about some "net-work," which his wife construct—eh hein! I go to my dictionary of Monsieur Walker, and I look for ze word—ah-ha! I find him, and he read in zis manner:—

"*Net-work*:—worked like a net."

Ma foi:—zis no definition!—I no comprehend what he meanst, so I borrow ze dictionary of Mons. Johnson, and I find ze word—He says zis:—

"*Net-work*:—Anything reticulated or decussated at equal distances, with interstices between the intersections."

Quel horreur—I never shall put in my mous such difficult words—for I shall dislocate ze bone of my teeths. Vere good! I shall look for zese hard words—by and by I shall soon find out vat for mean ze word net-work.

"*Reticulated*—Made of net-work; formed with interstitial vacuities."

Excellent!—I shall improve vere much!

"To *decussate*—to intersect at acute angles."

Eh bein! I come on superb!

"*Interstice*—space between one thing and another."

Pretty well!—we shall see—we shall see.

"*Intersection*—Point where lines cross each other."

Now I shall get him—I shall combine all ze definitions, and see vat he will make.

Net-work—Anything made of net-work: formed with interstitial vacuities, or intersected at acute angles at equal distances, with spaces between one thing and another, between the points where lines cross each other!!

You see, sare, vat I have done—shall I evere know vat is net-work?—Vere good! I have come to ze conclusion zat net-work means—net-work!

DEATH OF POLYCARP.—VOX POPULI.

When he appeared before the proconsul, the latter said to him, "Swear, curse Christ, and I will set you free!" The old man answered, "Eighty and six years have I received only good at his hands! Can I then curse him, my King and my Saviour!" When the proconsul continued to press him, Polycarp said, "Well, then, if you desire to know who I am, I tell thee freely, *I am a Christian!* If you desire to know what Christianity is, appoint an hour and hear me." The proconsul, who here showed that he did not act from any religious bigotry, and would gladly have saved the old man if he could silence the people, said to Polycarp, "Only persuade the people." He replied, "To you I felt myself bound to render an account; for our religion teaches us to treat the powers ordained by God with becoming reverence, as far as is consistent with our salvation. But as for those without, I consider them undeserving of any defense from me." And justly too! for what would it have been but throwing pearls before swine, to attempt to speak of the gospel to a wild, tumultuous, and fanatical mob? After the governor had in vain threatened him with wild beasts and the funeral pile, he made the herald publicly announce in the circus, that Polycarp had confessed himself a Christian. These words contained the sentence of death against him. The people instantly cried out, "This is the teacher of atheism, the father of the Christians, the enemy of our gods, who has taught so many not to pray to the gods, and not to sacrifice!" As soon the proconsul had complied with the demand of the populace, that Polycarp should perish on the funeral pile, Jew and Gentile hastened with the utmost eagerness to collect wood from the market-places and the baths. When they wished to fasten him with nails to the pile, the old man said, "Leave me thus, I pray, unfastened; He, who has enabled me to abide the fire, will give me strength also to remain firm on the stake." Before the fire was lighted, he prayed thus: "O Lord, Almighty God! the Father of thy beloved Son Jesus; through whom we have received a knowledge of Thee! God of the angels, and of the whole creation, of the whole human race, and of the saints, who live before thy presence! I thank thee that thou hast thought me worthy, this day, and this hour, to share the cup of thy Christ among the number of thy witnesses!"—*Neander.*

A TRUE STORY.

Not many years ago, a Polish lady, of plebeian birth, but of exceeding beauty and accomplishments, won the affections of a young nobleman, who, having her consent, solicited her from her father, and was refused. We may easily imagine the astonishment of the nobleman.

"Am I not," said he, "of sufficient rank to aspire to your daughter's hand?"

"You are, undoubtedly, of the best blood of Poland."

"And my fortune and reputation, are they not—"

"Your estate is magnificent, and your conduct is irreproachable."

"Then, having your daughter's consent how could I expect a reufsal?"

"This, sir," replied the father, "is my only child, and her happiness is the chief concern of my life. All the possessions of fortune are precarious; what fortune gives, at her caprice she takes away. I see no security for independence, and comfortable living of a wife, but one; in a word, I am resolved that no one shall be the husband of my daughter who is not at the same time *master of a trade!*"

The nobleman bowed, and retired silently. A year or two after, the father saw approaching his house wagons laden with baskets, and at the head of the cavalcade, a person in the dress of a basket-maker. And who do you suppose it was? The former suitor of his daughter—the nobleman turned basket-maker. He was now master of a trade; and brought the wares made by his own hands for inspection, and a certificate from his employer in testimony of his skill.

The condition being fulfilled, no further obstacle was opposed to the marriage. But the story is not yet told. The revolution came; fortunes were plundered, and lords were scattered as chaff before the four winds of heaven. Kings became beggars—some of them teachers—and the noble Pole supported his wife and her father through the infirmities of age, by his basket making industry.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

How unjustly a combination of circumstances may sometimes accuse a man, is well exemplified in the following actual occurrence, which is translated from the New-York "Deutsche Schnellpost":

"At a table-d'hote at Ludwigsburg, one of the company was showing a very rare gold coin, which passed round the table on a plate, and gave rise to many suppositions as to its age, country, value, &c. The conversation then gradually branched off to other subjects, till the coin was forgotten, and on the owner asking for it back, to the surprise of all, it was not to be found. A gentleman sitting at the foot of the table, was observed to be in much agitation, and as his embarrassment seemed to increase with the continuance of the search, the company were about to propose a very disagreeable measure, when suddenly a waiter entered the room, saying: "Here is the coin; the cook has just found it in one of the finger-glasses." The relief to all was manifest; and now the suspected stranger for the first time spoke as follows: "Gentlemen, none of you can rejoice more than myself at the recovery of the coin; for picture to yourselves my painful situation. By a singular coincidence, I have a duplicate of the very same coin in my purse! (here showing it to the company.) The idea that on the personal search which would probably be proposed, I would be taken for the purloiner of the coin, added to the fact that I am a stranger here, with no one to vouch for my integrity, had almost driven me distracted. The honesty of the cook, and lucky accident, has saved my honor." The friendly congratulations of the company soon effaced the remembrance of their unjust suspicions."

A NOBLE DOG.

A Halifax paper states that a child was playing with a Newfoundland dog on Roach's wharf, a short time since, and by some accident slipped over the end of the wharf into the water. The dog immediately sprang after the child, (who was only six years old,) and seizing the waist of his little frock, brought him into the dock where there was a stage, and by which the child held on, but was unable to get on top. The dog, seeing it was unable to pull the little fellow out of the water, ran up to a yard adjoining, and where a little girl of nine years of age was hanging up clothes. He seized the girl by the frock, and notwithstanding her exertion to get away, he succeeded in dragging her to the spot where the child was still hanging by the hands to the stage. On the girl's taking hold of the child, the dog assisted her in rescuing the little fellow from his perilous situation; and after licking the face of the infant it had thus saved, it took a leap off the stage, and swam round to the end of the wharf, and immediately returned with its hat in his mouth. It is said that the father of the child—to whom the dog belongs—when leaving the country where he formerly resided, rescued it from the hands of some persons who were about to execute the poor animal for killing a sheep.

From Bentley's London Miscellany.

HUNTING MONKEYS.

No country in the world, perhaps, offers such temptations for the true sportsman, as India. The quantity of game, particularly in Bengal, exceeds the most sanguine ideas of an untraveled Briton. The sport itself is considerably more majestic and more imposing. The wild peacock, the florikin, the black cock of India, are incomparably beyond the puny game of the West. The traveler, who has hunted the tiger, the lion, and the wild boar, may almost venture to look down on fox-hunting as a childish amusement. The very dangers which environ the eastern chase, give it an excitement as superior to that of Great Britain, as the fox-hunt boasts over the capture of a tame cat, or the destruction of a harmless rabbit. Remember, I am an Indian; I speak as an Indian; I write as an Indian. Were I an Apperly or a Nimrod, I might then view the subject in a different light.

The whole face of the country in the East, seems alive. A thousand species of birds, unknown in Europe—a thousand different kinds of animals, omitted by some of our best zoologists—a thousand venomous, but beautiful reptiles, vivify the scene. With a gun over the shoulder, a host of objects, besides those which are styled "legitimate game," offer themselves to tempt a shot, (not that I ever had the craving desire which some men feel, merely to kill or destroy, for the sake of wanton cruelty,) from their gay plumage, and curious form.

I was strolling through a wood, "high up the country," with my manton on my shoulder, my thoughts all centred in Europe, when I heard a curious noise in a tree almost immediately above me. I looked up, and found that the sounds proceeded from a white monkey, who skipped from branch to branch, chattering away with delight at beholding a "fellow-creature of larger growth," for so he decidedly seemed to consider me. For a few moments I took no notice of his antics, and walked quietly along, till suddenly a large branch fell at my feet, narrowly escaping my head. I again paused, and found that the missile had been dropped by my talkative friend. Without consideration, I instantly turned round, and fired at him.

The report had scarcely sounded, when I heard the most piercing, the most distressing cry that ever reached my ears. The agonized shriek of a young infant burst from the little creature whom I had wounded. It was within thirty paces of me. I could see the wretched animal, already stained with blood, point to its wound, and again hear its dreadful moan. The last agony of a hare is harrowing to the tryo; and I have seen the young sportsman turn pale on hearing it. The present cry, was, however, more distressing. I turned round, and endeavored to turn away. This, however, I found no easy task; for, as I moved forward, the unhappy creature followed me, springing, as well as it could, from bough to bough, uttering a low, wailing moan, and pointing at the same time to the spot whence the blood trickled. Then regarding me steadily, but mournfully in the face, it seemed to reproach me with my wanton cruelty. Again I hastened on, but still it pursued me. When I stopped, it stopped; when I attempted to go forward, it accompanied me. Never, in the whole course of my life, did I feel so much for a dumb animal; never did I so keenly repent an act of uncalled-for barbarity.

Determined not to allow the poor monkey thus to linger in torture, and at once to end the annoying scene, I suddenly came to a halt, and lowering my gun, which was only single-barreled, I was about to re-load it for the purpose of despatching the maimed creature, when, springing from the tree, it ran to within about a half-a-dozen paces of me, and began to cry so piteously, and roll itself in agony, occasionally picking up earth, with which it attempted to stanch the blood, by stuffing it into the wound, that, in spite of my resolution, when I fired, I was so nervous I almost missed my aim, inflicting another wound, which broke the animal's leg, but nothing more. Again its piercing shriek rang in my ears. Horrified beyond endurance, I threw down my gun, and actually fled.

In about half an hour I returned, for the purpose of fetching my manton, fully expecting that the poor animal had left the spot. What, then, was my surprise to find a crowd of monkeys surrounding the wretched sufferer. As I advanced under the shade of some trees, I stole almost close to them before they perceived me. I took advantage of this circumstance, to pause for a moment, and watch their movements. The stricken monkey was crying out in the most piteous manner; the others were busily employed in tearing open the wound, trying to destroy the already dreadfully-maimed creature. A shout drove them all away, save the dying animal. I advanced—the little animal was rolling in agony. I took up my gun, which lay beside him. I fancied he cast one look of supplication on me, one prayer to be relieved from his misery. I did not hesitate; with one blow of the butt-end I dashed out his brains. Then turning round, I slowly returned to my quarters, more profoundly dispirited than I had felt for many months.

Take my advice, sensible reader, if you must live in India, never shoot a monkey.

MR. ADAMS AND THE LADIES.

During the short sojourn of the Honorable John Quincy Adams in Washington, Pennsylvania, he paid a visit to the female seminary, near that place. He was welcomed in the spacious hall of the seminary, in the presence of a large number of ladies, by Miss S. R. Foster, the principal, in a neat and appropriate address. Mr. Adams responded, but so deeply was he affected by the address of Miss Foster, as to be some time inaudible. When heard, he spoke as follows:

"This, however, is the first instance in which a lady has thus addressed me personally; and I trust that all the ladies present will be able sufficiently to enter into my feelings, to know that I am more affected by this honor, than by any other I could have received.

You have been pleased, madam, to allude to the character of my father, and the history of my family, and their services to the country. It is indeed true, that from the existence of the republic as an independent nation, my father and myself have been in the public service of the country, almost without interruption. I came into the world as a person having responsibilities, with the Declaration of Independence, which constituted us a nation. I was a child at that time, and had then perhaps the greatest blessing that can be bestowed on a man—a mother who was anxious and capable to form her children to what they ought to be. From that mother I derived whatever of instruction—religious especially, and moral—has pervaded a long life; I will not say perfectly, as it ought to be; but I will say, because it is justice only to the memory of her whom I revere, that if, in the course of my life, there has been any imperfection, or deviation from what she taught me, the fault is mine, not hers.

With such a mother, and such other relations with the sex, of sister, wife, and daughter, it has been the perpetual axiom of my life to love and revere the female sex. And in order to carry that sentiment of love and reverence to its highest degree of perfection, I know of nothing that exists in human society better adapted to produce that result, than institutions of the character that I have now the honor to address.

I have been taught, as I have said, through the course of my life, to love and revere the female sex; but I have been taught also—and that lesson has, perhaps, impressed itself on my mind—even more strongly, it may be, than the other—I have been taught not to flatter them. It is not unusual in the intercourse of men with the other sex—and especially for young men—to think that the way to win the hearts of the ladies, is by flattery. To love and revere the sex, is what I think the duty of men; but not to flatter them; and this I would say to the young ladies here; and if they, and others present, would allow me, with all the authority which nearly four-score of years may have with those who have not yet attained one score—I would say to them, what I have no doubt they say to themselves, and are taught here, not to take flattery of men as proof of perfection.

I am now, however, I fear, assuming too much of a character that does not exactly belong to me. I therefore conclude, by assuring you, madam, that your reception of me has affected me, as you perceive, more than I can express in words; and that I shall offer my best prayers, till my latest hour, to the Creator of us all, that this Institution especially, and all others of a similar kind, designed to form the female mind to wisdom and virtue, may prosper to the end of time.

CATERPILLAR LACE.

Lace made by caterpillars has been contrived by an officer of engineers, residing at Munich. It consists of lace, and veils, with open patterns in them, made entirely by caterpillars. The following is the mode of proceeding adopted:—Having made a paste of the leaves of the plant on which the species of caterpillar he employs, feeds, he spreads it thinly over a stone, or other flat substance of the required size. He then, with a camel-hair pencil, dipped in olive oil, draws the pattern he wishes the insects to leave open. This stone is then placed in an inclined position, and a considerable number of the catterpillars are placed at the bottom. A peculiar species is chosen, which spins a strong web, and the animals commence at the bottom, eating and spinning their way up to the top, carefully avoiding every part touched by the oil, but devouring every other part of the paste. The extreme lightness of these veils, combined with some strength, is truly surprising. One of them measuring twenty-six and a half inches, by seventeen inches, weighed only 1,51 grains, a degree of lightness which will appear more strongly by contrast with other fabrics. One square yard of the substance, of which these veils are made, weighs four grains and one-third.—*Journal of Commerce.*

Advantages of Science.—Mr. Holbrook, of Medway, the celebrated bell-founder, who has put up a clock upon the Baptist church in this town the present week, gave us a little incident of life, which is worth relating, if for nothing more than to show the importance of a knowledge of chemistry. An immense pile of cinders and dross had accumulated near his foundry, which was supposed to be entirely worthless, and was used to fill up stone walls, &c. A foreigner who happened to be in town examined the pile one day, and offered $100 for it. So large a price excited Mr. C.'s suspicions that the cinders might contain valuable metal, and he declined selling it. The man then offered $200, which of course confirmed his opinion, and, after a little parley, the stranger acknowledged that he was acquainted with a process by which valuable metal might be extracted from the cinders, which he offered to divulge for a small compensation. A furnace and apparatus were constructed according to his direction, and, when the whole pile was run through, the mass of neglected rubbish yielded a nett profit of thirteen thousand dollars. So much for knowing "how to do it."—*Lynn Freeman.*

A Match for a Distiller.—A distiller in a neighboring state went to hear a reformed drunkard, thinking to brow-beat him by his presence. The reformed man, with much eloquence, compared Alcohol to Juggernaut, and said he had a temple in that place, pointing to the distillery, whose floor was strewed with human bones, and if he had a chance he should like to preach a sermon there. On coming out, the distiller said, "So, old fellow, you would like to preach a sermon in my temple, would you; when will you come?" "Soon as you get a congregation together," said the reformed man. "And what will be your text," was asked. "*Out of the belly of hell, cried I, and thou hearest my voice!*" The distiller was posed.—Journal. Am. Tem. Union.

A Good Toast.—The following toast was given at a temperance dinner:

"Revolutionary Army and the Cold Water Army. The one drove the *red coats* from the land—the other the *red noses*."—*Old Dominion.*

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress.* The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite.—*Job.* xvii. 8.

Abhor detraction, the sin of fallen angels, and the worst of fallen men.—*Wm. Penn.*

NARRATIVE of the Proceedings of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and their Subsequent Confirmation by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in the case of Isaac T. Hopper. Just published, and for sale at this office, No. 143 Nassau street, New-York; and at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 31 North Fifth street, Philadel-

KENNETT SQUARE BOARDING SCHOOL.

For Young Men and Boys.

THIS institution occupies one of the most pleasant and healthy situations in Chester county, Pa. on the mail route between Baltimore and Philadelphia, and about 12 miles northwest of Wilmington, Delaware. With each of the above-mentioned places, there is an easy communication by means of stages.

The course of mathematical instruction will include algebra, geometry, plane and spherical trigonometry, surveying, mensuration, astronomy, &c.

The ordinary branches of an English education, reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, geography, history, composition, &c.—will be thoroughly taught. Instruction will also be given in book-keeping, and in the Latin and French languages. The study of Botany will be made thorough and practical—the pupils with their teacher, will make frequent excursions, for the examination of plants, during the season of flowers.

Parents may rest assured that the most careful attention will be paid to the health and morals of the pupils. The neighborhood has acquired no small degree of distinction for its highly intellectual and moral standing.

Scholars, coming from a distance will be expected to board at the institution, where they will be under the constant care of the teacher.

TERMS:—For tuition, boarding, washing, &c. $30 per term of *eleven weeks*, one half payable in advance. An extra charge of $4, will be made for instruction in either of the languages. Boys, under twelve years, studying the common branches only, may be admitted for $25 per term. Pupils will furnish their own wash-basins and towels. Books and stationery furnished at the usual prices.

The term will commence the first second day in the eleventh month (November). There will be two vacations; one in the spring, the other in the fall.

JONATHAN LAMBORN, *Principal.*
JEREMIAH HAYHURST, *Teacher.*

Chester co. Pa. August 31, 1843. 6m.

Lehigh and Schuylkill Coal.

THE best coal, of the above description, selected carefully for family use, can be had by leaving orders with J. M. McKim, at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 31 North Fifth street, Philadelphia.

August 22, 1843.—tf.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortment of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail.

CHARLES WISE,
Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets.
Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, North Fifth street.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; *i. e.* $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

$10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for twenty copies.

A full assortment of anti-slavery publications is kept constantly on hand. Also, a handsome variety of miscellaneous books, and useful and fancy stationery.

All letters relating to the business of the office should be directed to *J. Miller McKim*, No. 31 North Fifth s

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

EDWARD M. DAVIS, Philadelphia, Penn.
J. MILLER M'KIM, " "
AMARANCY PAINE, Providence, R. I.
LORRIN WHITING, New Marlborough, Mass.
LUTHER MYRICK, Cazenovia, N. Y.
W. C. BLOSS, Rochester, N. Y.
JAMES COOPER, Williamson, Wayne Co., N. Y.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, " "
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario Co., N. Y.
WM. T. CRITTENDEN, Rushville, " "
WM. P. POWELL, No. 61 Cherry st., New-York City
THOMAS MCCLINTOCK, Waterloo, N. Y.
MORRIS EARLE, Penn Yan, Yates Co., N. Y.
R. D. H. YEEKLEY, Rushville, N. Y.
ROBERT H. FOLGER, Massillon, Ohio.
SETH WHITMORE, Dixon's Ferry, Lee Co., Il.
SLOCOMB HOWLAND, Sherwood Corners, Cayuga co. N.Y
PRINCE JACKSON, Syracuse, Onondaga Co., N. Y.
THOS. HUTCHINSON, King's Ferry, Cayuga Co. N. Y
CALEB B. ROGERS, Norwich, Conn.
H. W. WILLIAMS, 25 Cornhill, Boston, Mass.
J. C. MERRITT, Bethpage, L. I.
JESSE HOLMES, Lloydsville, Belmont Co., Ohio.
JOSEPH A. DUGDALE, Cortsville, Clark Co., Ohio.
JAMES BOYLE, Cincinnati, Ohio.
ASAPH TURNER, Geneva, Ashtabula Co. Ohio.
JAMES AUSTIN, Marlborough, Stark Co. "
ISAAC LEWIS, Short Creek, Harrison Co., Ohio.
DR. ABRAHAM BROOKE, Oakland, Clinton Co., Ohio.
WILLIAM CRAFT, St. Clairsville, Ohio.
Capt. ALEXANDER H. ROBINSON, Nantucket, Mass.
DOCTOR IDDINGS, Greensboro, Henry county, Ia.
R. E. GITLET, Oberlin, Lorain Co. Ohio.
DAVID WOOD, Mt. Gilead, Marion county, Ohio